E-UN-78

TAMIL NADU LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
வாய்மையே வெல்லும்
TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS

Issued 1-3-33.

VOL. LXIV. No. 2

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

OF THE GOVERNOR OF MADRAS

OFFICIAL REPORT

THIRD SESSION OF THE FOURTH LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL UNDER THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA ACT, 1919

Tuesday, the 24th January 1933

CONTENTS

	PAGES
Members present ..	155–156
I. Questions and Answers ..	156–185, 252–255
II. Adjournment motion *re* the postponement of District and Taluk Boards elections in the Kistna district ..	185, 226–251
III. A Bill to amend the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920 (Bill No. 25 of 1932)—His Excellency the Governor's Message ..	186
Non-official Business.	
IV. A Bill to amend the Madras District Municipalities Act, 1920 (Bill No. 26 of 1932)—Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar ..	186–212
V. Resolutions on matters of general public interest :	
(1) Establishment of a Broadcasting service for the Madras Presidency ..	212
(2) Remission of 12½ per cent in the existing rate of assessment on ryotwari lands in the Presidency ..	213–226
VI. Papers laid on the table of the House ..	251, 256–296

MADRAS
PRINTED BY THE SUPERINTENDENT, GOVERNMENT PRESS

1933

Price, 8 annas.

THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL OF THE GOVERNOR OF MADRAS.

Tuesday, the 24th January 1933.

The House met at eleven of the clock, Mr. President (the hon. Mr. B. RAMACHANDRA REDDI) in the Chair.

PRESENT:

Usman Sahib Bahadur, K.C.I.E., The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed.
Krishnan Nayar, *Kt.*, The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M.
Campbell, K.C.I.E., C.S.I., C.B.E., V.D., I.C.S., The hon. Sir Archibald.
Stokes, C.S.I., C.I.E., I.C.S., The hon. Mr. H. G.
Raja of Bobbili, The hon. the
Rajan, The hon. Mr. P. T.
Kumaraswami Reddiyar, The hon. Diwan Bahadur S.
Abdul Hameed Khan Sahib Bahadur.
Ahmed Miran Sahib Bahadur.
Alagannan Chettiyar, Rao Sahib A. S.
Alamelumangathayaramma, Mrs. K.
Arasu, Mr. V. T.
Ari Gowder, Mr. H. B.
Basheer Ahmed Sayeed Sahib Bahadur.
Basu Dev, Mr. C.
Bayappa Reddi, Mr. P.
Beyabani Sahib Bahadur, S. M. K.
Bhanoji Rao, Mr. A. V.
Davis, Mr. J. A.
Devadasan, Mr. M.
Dharmalingam Pillai, Rao Sahib V.
Duraiswami Reddiyar, Mr. K. M.
Ellappa Chettiyar, Diwan Bahadur S.
Foulkes, Mr. R.
Gopalaswami Mudaliyar, Diwan Bahadur M.
Harischandrudu Nayudu, Mr. A.
Hood, I.C.S., Mr. H. M.
Indriah, Mr. C.
Jagannatham, Mr. H. M.
Jayaram Nayudu, Rao Sahib C.
Jones, Mr. C. E.
Kesava Ramamurti Nayudu, Mr. K.
Khalif-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur, Khan Bahadur P.
Kolanda Reddi, Rai Sahib C.
Krishnayya Choudari, Mr. P. V.
Krishnamurti, Rao Sahib D.
Krishnan, Mr. C.
Kumara Raja of Venkatagiri, The
Kuppuswami Choudari, Mr. J.
Lakshmana Reddi, Mr. G.
Langley, Mr. W. K. M.
Luker, Mr. F. G.
Madanagopal Nayudu, Mr. R.
Madhusoodhanan Thangal, Mr. P.
Maharaja of Venkatagiri, The
Mahboob Ali Baig Sahib Bahadur.
Mahmud Schamnad Sahib Bahadur, Khan Bahadur.
Manikkavelu Nayakar, Mr. M. A.
Moidoo Sahib Bahadur, Khan Bahadur T. M.
Muhammad Meera Ravuttar Bahadur, K. P. V. S.
Muniswami Nayudu, Diwan Bahadur B.
Muniswami Pillai, Rao Sahib V. I.
Murugappa Chettiyar, Diwan Bahadur A. M. M.
Muthiah Chettiyar, Mr. M. A.
Muthu Chettiyar, Rao Bahadur P. C.
Nachiyappa Gounder, Mr. K. A.
Nanjappa Bahadur, Subadar-Major S. A.
Narasimhaswami, Rao Sahib D. V.
Narayanan Nambiyar, Mr. V. P.
Natesa Mudaliyar, Rao Bahadur C.
Palat, Mr. R. M.
Pannirselvam, Rao Bahadur A. T.
Parthasarathi Ayyangar, Mr. C. R.
Patnaik Mahasayo, Sriman M. G.
Pocker Sahib Bahadur, B.
Premayya, Mr. G. R.
Rajagopala Pillai, Mr. P. V.
Ramachandra Padayachi, Mr. P. K.
Ramalingam Chettiyar, Rao Bahadur T. A.
Ramamurti, Pandit Ganala.
Raman Menon, Mr. K. P.
Ramaswami Ayyar, Mr. T. S.
Ramaswami Mudaliyar, Mr. V. M.
Ranganatha Mudaliyar, Mr. A.
Ranganatha Mudaliyar, Mr. G.
Ranganatha Mudaliyar, Mr. M. D. T.
Rangaswami Reddi, Mr. M. B.
Sahajanandam, Swami A. S.
Sami Venkatachalam Chetti, Mr.
Sesha Reddi, Mr. B. P.
Shetty, Mr. A. B.
Simhachalam Pantulu, Mr. Gade.
Singam Ayyangar, Mr. K.
Siva Raj, Rao Sahib N.
Slater C.M.G., C.I.E., I.C.S., Mr. S. H.

PRESENT—*cont.*

Smith, C.I.E., I.C.S., Mr. E. C.
Sreshta, Mr. M. S.
Srinivasa Ayyangar, Mr. T. C.
Srinivasan, Rao Bahadur R.
Stanes, Mr. F. J.
Subbarayan, Dr. P.
Subrahmanya Chetti, Rao Sahib P.
Subrahmanya Bhatt, Mr. U. C.
Sundara Rao Nayudu, Mr. T.
Syed Tajuddin Sahib Bahadur, Khan Sahib.
Thorne, C.I.E., I.C.S., Mr. J. A.
Vasudeva Pillai, Mr. V. G.
Venkatarama Ayyar, Mr. K. R.
Venugopal Nayudu, Rao Bahadur R. K.
Wright, Mr. W. O.
Yakub Hasan Sahib Bahadur.
Zamindar of Bodinayakkanur, The
Zamindar of Chemudu, The
Zamindar of Kirlampudi, The
Zamindar of Mirzapuram, The

I.—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

STARRED QUESTIONS

Education

Delay in the publication of the detailed text-book in Telugu for the Higher Elementary Grade of the T.S.L.C. Examination, 1934.

* 462 *Q.*—Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(*a*) when the recommendations of the Advisory Committee for the detailed Telugu text-book for the Higher Elementary grade of the T.S.L.C. Examination of 1934 were received in the Office of the Commissioner for Government Examinations, Madras;

(*b*) when the editor was required to prepare the manuscript;

(*c*) when the manuscript for the book was received from the editor;

(*d*) when the manuscript was sent to the Government Press for printing;

(*e*) whether the book has been published and, if so, when copies were made available to the public;

(*f*) if the book was not ready in July, what the reason was for the delay; and

(*g*) whether it is a fact that remuneration was paid to the editor in March 1932 by the Secretary before the work was completed; if so, whether the Secretary was permitted to do so; if not permitted, what action the Government have taken in the matter?

A.—(*a*) On 25th September 1931.

(*b*) On 16th October 1931.

(*c*) *Poetry portion.*—The editor reported on the 25th November 1931, that on the 5th of that month he sent the manuscript of the poetry portion (except 20 lines) to the Convener of the Advisory Committee; as the latter mislaid it, a duplicate copy of the complete poetry portion was received on 7th May 1932.

Prose portion.—On 27th January 1932.

(*d*) Poetry portion on 10th May 1932. Prose portion on 27th January 1932.

24th January 1933]

(e) Yes; from 16th December 1932.

(f) Owing to the pressure of other urgent work it was not possible for the Government Press to attend to the printing of the text-book.

(g) The remuneration was paid as soon as the manuscript was ready. The Secretary had the necessary permission.

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—" May I ask the hon. Minister to let me know who is the gentleman who is the Convener of the Advisory Committee, who lost the duplicate copy of the poetry portion ? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR :—" Notice."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—" Are not these papers kept in the office? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR :—" I suppose so."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—" So, is it the office which lost the papers or mislaid it? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR :—" I presume so."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED :—" May I ask, if a duplicate copy of the complete poetry portion was received on 7th May 1932, when the amount of remuneration was paid to him? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR :—" Notice."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED :—" If the amount has been paid much earlier, may I know if it was done merely with a view to avoid the surrender of the grant or merely to enable the grant to be spent? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR :—" I cannot say offhand whether it was paid much earlier."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—" In answer to clause (g), it is said, 'The remuneration was paid as soon as the manuscript was ready. The Secretary had the necessary permission.' May I know if the Secretary has general permission to pay whenever and wherever he likes? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR :—" He had permission to pay in this particular case."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—" In view of the fact that he had permission to pay in this case, does it mean that he has permission to do so in other cases also? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR :—" I do not think so."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—" Is such general permission given to him in other cases also? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR :—" Notice, Sir."

[24th January 1933

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"Was it a written or oral permission in this case?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR:—"Notice."

Admission of Oriya candidates for the B.Ed. course in the Training College at Rajahmundry.

* 463 *Q.*—Sriman M. G. PATNAIK Mahasayo: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(*a*) the number of candidates who are trained in the Training College at Rajahmundry for the B.Ed. degree examination of the Andhra University;

(*b*) the number of Oriya candidates admitted for training in 1932–33 in the Training College at Rajahmundry, for the said examination;

(*c*) the number of Oriya candidates who applied for such admission; and

(*d*) the authority that makes the selection?

A.—(*a*) One hundred.

(*b*) Four were selected for admission but only two joined.

(*c*) Ten.

(*d*) The College Selection Committee.

Admission of students into the Government Training School at Bellary.

* 464 *Q.*—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Education and Excise be pleased to state—

(*a*) the number of students in the secondary classes in the Government Training School, Bellary, at present and the number of those among them who are natives of Bellary district;

(*b*) the number of students in the secondary classes in the Government Training School, Hospet, during 1928–29 and 1929–30;

(*c*) the number of applications for admission to the junior and senior secondary classes of the Government Training School, Hospet, in 1930–31 and 1931–32 respectively;

(*d*) whether any students were admitted to the junior section of the above school during the said two years and if so, how many in each year and if none, why; and

(*e*) the arrangements, if any, made to open secondary classes during 1932–33?

A.—(*a*)	Total number of students	70
	Number from the Bellary district	23
(*b*)	1928–29	22
	1929–30	12

	Number of applicants for the Junior class.	Number of applicants for the Senior class.
(*c*) 1930–31	..	..
1931–32	11	..

24th January 1933]

(*d*) None. Admissions to the secondary training class in Hospet have to be made only in alternate years. According to this arrangement, admissions should have been made in 1931–32; but of the 11 candidates who applied in that year only two were qualified for admission. This number being too small, no junior class was formed.

(*e*) A secondary training class was not opened in the Government Training School, Hospet, in 1932–33 as the number of candidates who applied for training in that class was only three, and as one of these was admitted into the Training School, Bellary.

Public Works

Qualifications of the Consulting Architect to the Government of Madras.

* 465 *Q.*—Mr. V. T. ARASU: Will the hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(*a*) the qualifications of the present Consulting Architect to the Government of Madras; and

(*b*) the date on which, and the period for which, the appointment was made?

A.—(*a*) (1) Fellow of the Incorporated Association of Architects and Surveyors (F.I.A.A.).

(2) Associate of the Indian Institute of Architects (A.I.I.A.).

(3) Practical experience of more than ten years as Director of Town-Planning, Madras.

(*b*) On 30th January 1932 afternoon. The appointment has not been made for any definite period. The Director of Town-Planning holds the post of Consulting Architect in addition.

Mr. V. T. ARASU:—" May I know whether the hon. Minister is aware of the fact that F.I.A.A. is nowhere recognized as a suitable qualification for appointment as the Consulting Architect, as the R.I.B.A.? "

The hon. Mr. P. T. RAJAN:—" I am not aware."

Mr. V. T. ARASU:—" May I know if the hon. Minister is aware of the fact that F.I.A.A. can be obtained by any layman by payment of a certain fee? "

The hon. Mr. P. T. RAJAN:—" I know nothing about it."

Mr. V. T. ARASU:—" In that case, may I know whether the Government have made enquiries and satisfied themselves that the present incumbent is fully qualified to hold the post of Consulting Architect? "

The hon. Mr. P. T. RAJAN:—" I presume he can do the work to which he has been appointed."

[24th January 1933

Mr. V. T. Arasu:—"May I know if the Government have advertised before making this appointment and called for applications from qualified people?"

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—"No advertisement has been made."

Mr. V. T. Arasu:—"May I know whether the Government are aware that there are men available in the Madras Presidency who are fully qualified, being Members of the Royal Institute of British Architects?"

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—"I do not know whether there are men available or not."

Mr. V. T. Arasu:—"May I know if the present incumbent has applied to Government for leave in order to proceed to England and qualify himself hereafter?"

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—"I am not aware of it."

Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan:—"If the Government know that qualified men are available will they call for applications?"

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—"If there is necessity, they will do so."

Mr. V. T. Arasu:—"May I know if the Government first ascertained whether this gentleman is fully qualified or not?"

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—"They thought that he could do the work."

Mr. V. T. Arasu:—"Do the Government think that any one can do that work?"

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—"Not any one, but one who is qualified to do the work."

Mr. V. T. Arasu:—"May I know if the Government are satisfied that this gentleman is qualified to do the work?"

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—"If they were not satisfied, they would not have appointed him."

Diwan Bahadur M. Gopalaswami Mudaliyar:—"May I know why applications were not called for?"

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—"Because this gentleman was thought fit for the post by the Government, and the Government did not think it necessary to call for applications."

Mr. V. T. Arasu:—"May I know whether Government came to the conclusion that this gentleman has the necessary qualification for the post of Consulting Architect?"

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—"At the time of the appointment, he was considered fit to occupy the post."

Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti:—"Is it as a matter of retrenchment that they combined the appointment of the Director of Town-Planning with that of the Consulting Architect?"

The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan:—"That is so, Sir."

24th January 1933]

Mr. V. T. ARASU :—" May I know the additional remuneration paid for holding the post of Consulting Architect? "

The hon. Mr. P. T. RAJAN :—" I think he is paid Rs. 200 for the additional work."

Mr. V. T. ARASU :—" If such an amount is paid, where does retrenchment come in? "

The hon. Mr. P. T. RAJAN :—" Instead of appointing a full-time officer, only an allowance is paid to this officer for the additional work."

Local Self-Government

Cases of alleged irregularities in the conduct of elections to local bodies.

* 466 *Q.*—Mr. M. A. MANIKKAVELU NAYAKAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) what the districts are in which taluk and district board elections have been held so far under the amended Act;

(*b*) how many petitions from candidates alleging irregularities and other defects in the conduct of elections were received by Government from each of the districts in which local board elections have been held;

(*c*) how the Government disposed of those petitions;

(*d*) whether the Government ordered re-election in any case; and

(*e*) if so, in how many cases and on what grounds?

A.—(*a*) Except for 2 circles in the Tanjore Taluk Board and for the District and Taluk Boards in the Kistna district, elections have been completed in all the districts in the Presidency.

(*b*) & (*c*) Numerous petitions were received, some by the Inspector of Municipal Councils and others by Government. In a few cases, Government set aside the orders of the Election Officers irregularly accepting or rejecting nomination papers. In some cases, where the poll had been stopped before the prescribed hour owing to the unruly behaviour of the mob outside the polling stations or other causes, a continuation poll was ordered in those stations on a fresh date fixed by the Inspector or the Government. Government ordered a fresh poll only in one case, as it was reported that a continuation poll ordered for 2 hours had proved infructuous.

(*d*) The answer is in the negative.

(*e*) The question does not arise.

Mr. M. A. MANIKKAVELU NAYAKAR :—" In answer to clauses (*b*) and (*c*), it is said, ' Numerous petitions were received, some by the Inspector of Municipal Councils and others by Government.' In view of that, may I know what steps the Government propose to take to minimize the irregularities? "

[24th January 1933

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI :—" The steps to be taken in each case should be considered on its merits."

Mr. M. A. MANIKKAVELU NAYAKAR :—" In view of the fact that there were a large number of petitions alleging irregularities, may I ask if the hon. the Chief Minister proposes to take some action in the matter? "

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI :—" I cannot answer a general question like that. If specific complaints are received, they will be investigated."

Mr. M. A. MANIKKAVELU NAYAKAR :—" Is the hon. Chief Minister satisfied that the conduct of local board elections all over the Presidency has been quite satisfactory? "

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI :—" I cannot say that they have been quite satisfactory throughout. But Government did whatever lay in their power to have them conducted satisfactorily."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED :—" May I ask whether Government contemplate issuing a report about the conduct of local board elections in this Presidency after the same is completed? "

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI :—" There is no intention of doing so at present. If it is considered desirable, the Government will consider the matter."

Extension of the date fixed for the publication of the final electoral roll of the taluk boards in the Kistna district.

* 467 *Q.*—Rai Sahib C. KOLANDA REDDI : Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that the period for the publication of the final electoral roll of the taluk boards in the Kistna district has been extended from 4th December 1932 to 22nd December 1932; and

(*b*) if so, why this extension was made in the Kistna district ?

A.—(*a*) The date of publication of the final electoral roll of the taluk boards in the Kistna district has been last postponed to the 28th February 1933.

(*b*) A change in the holder of the office of District Election Officer and the receipt of about 80,000 claims for and objections to inclusion in the electoral registers of taluks except Gudivada contribute to the delay in the publication of the final electoral roll. Some twenty to thirty thousand claims and objections are also expected to be filed in the Gudivada taluk.

Mr. V. T. ARASU :—" Will the hon. the Chief Minister state the reasons which necessitated the Government to postpone the publication of the final electoral roll? "

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI :—" The reasons are given in the answer to the question."

24th January 1933]

Mr. V. T. Arasu :—" May I know whether the hon. the Chief Minister will be pleased to state as to who will have to bear the cost of the republication of these electoral rolls, whether it is the Government or the taluk boards? "

The hon. the Raja of Bobbili :—" The taluk boards."

Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti :—" Is it suggested that the previous Election Officer omitted the names of 80,000 voters in the electoral rolls? "

The hon. the Raja of Bobbili :—" It was no case of omission, but that there were 80,000 claims for and objection to inclusion in the rolls. In all these cases, the claims and objections have to be examined so that the proper names may be entered in the registers."

Rai Sahib C. Kolanda Reddi :—" Is it not that the large number of claims and objections was due to the extension of the period for receipt of objections? Some three extensions have been made within a period of one month."

The hon. the President :—" The hon. Member will please sit down to receive an answer."

The hon. the Raja of Bobbili :—" Extensions first of all were made at the request of one party or the other. After a large number of claims and objections were received, it was found necessary to extend the date, as each application has to be looked into on its merits and notices given to the parties."

Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti :—" May I know who the parties concerned are who made representations to Government? "

The hon. the Raja of Bobbili :—" The Inspector reports that one instance is the Raja of Mirzapuram. Another is the Raja of Chellapalli. There were others also."

Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti :—" On what grounds did they apply for extension? "

The hon. the Raja of Bobbili :—" They wanted time to submit claims and objections."

Rai Sahib C. Kolanda Reddi :—" Has such extension been made in any other district than Kistna? "

The hon. the Raja of Bobbili :—" Might have been made. I cannot answer it offhand."

Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti :—" Were the applications of the Raja of Chellapalli and the Raja of Mirzapuram made in a representative capacity? "

The hon. the Raja of Bobbili :—" They made their representations to the Inspector of Local Boards, and the Government is responsible for the extensions so given."

Rai Sahib C. Kolanda Reddi :—" Were the applications made only to ask for extension? "

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—" I will just read the report of the Inspector: 'It will further be noted in this connexion that the previous hon. Member ordered that no election proceedings could be held during the Legislative Council sessions or when the Tanjore Conference took place. In compliance with this order, and in view of the fact that the leading men of the Kistna district would be absent, the dates for the receipt of the presentation of claims and objections were extended. The Raja of Mirzapuram wanted slight adjustment, and the Raja of Chellapalli represented to the Inspector that there should be a slight adjournment of the dates fixed for the disposal of claims and objections'."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—" May I know what the *locus standi* of these gentlemen is with reference to these elections?"

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—" I presume they represent their parties in the local boards."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—" Do the Government recognize the existence of such parties in the local boards?"

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—" The Government have to take into consideration the several interests."

Mr. V. T. ARASU:—" May I know whether the District Board of Kistna or the taluk boards concerned, did at any time, ask the Government to postpone the dates?"

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—" No, Sir."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—" May I ask whether there were any representations from the members of the public other than those quoted by the hon. Minister?"

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—" I cannot say offhand. I must ascertain it from the Inspector."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—" May I ask whether the receipt of claims and objections was peculiar to this district alone or was it so in the case of other districts also?"

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—" I think there was a large number of claims and objections in this district more than any other district."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—" What has the Legislative Council session or the Tanjore Conference to do with these elections in the Kistna district?"

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—" I cannot answer the question offhand. I want notice to look into the papers."

Rai Sahib C. KOLANDA REDDI:—" In addition to Kistna District Election Officer, will the election officers of Guntur and Ellore be ordered to dispose of these applications?"

24th January 1933]

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—" The progress done by the present Election Officer in the matter of disposals will be examined, and if Government are not satisfied with the progress, additional staff will be appointed."

Rai Sahib C. KOLANDA REDDI:—" At the rate of the present disposals, it will take three or four months to finish the work?"

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—" When the Government receive the report, the matter will be considered to expedite disposals."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—" Will the Government consider whether it is not desirable to appoint another Election Officer instead of postponing dates?"

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—" I have already answered the question."

Mr. V. T. ARASU:—" May I know whether the District Board of Kistna or the taluk boards concerned were ever consulted as to the desirability of postponing the dates already fixed? If so, what was their reply?"

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—" I think it is unnecessary to consult them with reference to the disposal of claims and objections. Sufficient time should be allowed for the disposal of those matters."

Mr. G. SIMHACHALAM PANTULU:—" May I know if the Government have cancelled the order already passed appointing an additional election officer for Guntur?" 11-15 a.m.

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—" There cannot be any cross-examination."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—" May I know what the peculiar circumstances of the Kistna district were which necessitated the postponement of election?"

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—" I have already answered the question. There were a large number of claims and petitions received regarding the preparation of the electoral rolls."

Rai Sahib C. KOLANDA REDDI:—" May I know when the elections will be held?"

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—" After the claims and objections have been disposed of, a date will be fixed; but I am afraid I am now unable to give the exact date."

Rai Sahib C. KOLANDA REDDI:—" Supposing it becomes necessary to postpone elections for six or seven months, will the hon. Minister appoint an additional Election Officer?"

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—" I presume the elections will be over in a month or two."

[24th January 1933

Mr. V. T. Arasu:—" When the Government thought fit to take cognizance of representations made by private individuals, may I know what prevented them from consulting the district board concerned? "

The hon. the Raja of Bobbili:—" District boards are in no case consulted in regard to the postponement of elections."

Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti:—" May I know if it is a fact that until the date was extended, there was no claim petition received? "

The hon. the Raja of Bobbili:—" As stated in the report I read out, at the request of both parties the date has been extended. First the date for filing claims was extended and afterwards, when a large number of claims were received, it was found necessary to extend the time."

Postponement of the elections to the local boards in the Kistna district.

* 468 *Q.*—Rai Sahib C. Kolanda Reddi: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether Kistna is the only district in which elections to the local boards are not yet held;

(*b*) whether in respect of the Kistna district local boards elections, the period for receiving claims and objections has been extended from 15th November 1932 to 1st December 1932 and again to 10th December 1932, and the period for publication of final roll of voters has been extended from 4th December 1932 to 22nd December 1932, and then to 3rd January 1933 and again to 10th January 1933; and

(*c*) why so many extensions have been made ?

A.—(*a*) The answer is in the affirmative.

(*b*) The period for publication of claims and objections has been last extended up to 10th January 1933 and that for the publication of the final electoral roll up to the 28th February 1933.

(*c*) A change of the District Election Officer and the receipt of about 80,000 claims for and objections to the inclusion in the electoral registers of taluks (except Gudivada) contribute to the delay in the publication of the final roll. Some twenty to thirty thousand claims and objections are also expected to be filed in the Gudivada taluk.

Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti:—" May I know if any claims and petitions were received before the first extension of the date? "

The hon. the Raja of Bobbili:—" I had not asked for that information in the report. I presume that some claims might have been received before the first extension. Owing to the large number of claims and objections the parties wanted to present, they asked for extension."

Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar:—" In view of the large number of claims filed and in view of the fact that the date has been fixed as

28th February for the publication of the electoral rolls, will the hon. Minister take the necessary steps to see that all the claims are disposed of before then and that what he has undertaken is carried out?"

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"I would see that the necessary steps are taken to dispose of the claims and objections in time."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"When was the claim of the Raja of Mirzapuram made?"

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"I have no information."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"Was it before or after the hon. the Chief Minister took office?"

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"I think it was before I took office."

Mr. V. T. ARASU:—"May I know whether the Government would act as in the case of the Kistna district if similar objections are received on similar occasions in respect of other districts?"

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"If any representation is made and the Government feel that it is worthy of consideration, they will consider."

Mr. V. T. ARASU:—"Do the Government feel that the petitions filed by the Rajas of Mirzapuram and Chellapalli are reasonable and that they should interfere?"

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"Yes, Sir."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"Were the representations of the Rajas of Chellapalli and Mirzapuram made simultaneously?"

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"No."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—"Whose was received earlier?"

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—"I cannot say."

Exemption of the Motor lorries owned by the Burmah-Shell Company from the levy of fees by the Local Boards and Municipalities.

* 469 *Q.*—Mr. M. D. T. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that Government orders have been sent to local boards and municipalities directing them not to levy fees for the petrol and oil lorries owned by the Burmah-Shell Company running in the mufassal stations;

(*b*) whether such order is in conformity with the provisions of the several Acts relating thereto;

(*c*) what the special reasons are which actuated the Government in issuing such orders;

(*d*) how many such lorries are being run in this Presidency both by the Burmah-Shell Company and other petrol companies;

[24th January 1933

(e) what will be the total amount of loss which the local boards and municipalities incur on account of such exemption;

(f) whether they are private lorries or lorries owned by business firms for the purpose of conveying petrol from one place to another;

(g) whether such exemption applies or has been granted to the Standard Oil Company and other similar companies; and

(h) if not, the reasons why the exemption has not been granted to all petrol companies?

A.—(a), (b) & (c) G.Os.[a] No. 781, L. & M., dated 29th February 1932, and No. 1263, L. & M., dated 6th April 1932, are laid on the table.

(d), (e) & (f) The Government have no information.

(g) & (h) The orders quoted above are applicable to all private lorries.

Mr. V. T. Arasu:—" May I know the reason why the Government thought fit to exempt lorries belonging to the Burmah-Shell Company from the payment of licence fees when they are making money out of them? "

The hon. the Raja of Bobbili:—" The Government made no distinction whatever between these lorries and other lorries. The Committee appointed to examine the incidence of taxation recommended that all private vehicles should be exempted."

Mr. V. T. Arasu:—" Do the Government think that the lorries owned by the above company are private lorries and are not used in furtherance of their trade? "

The hon. the Raja of Bobbili:—" As they are not plying for hire, they come under the category of private lorries."

Mr. V. T. Arasu:—" In view of the fact that these lorries use the roads more frequently than even lorries plying for hire, will the Government revise their order and direct them to pay the usual licence fee? "

The hon. the Raja of Bobbili:—" If they are hired lorries, certainly they would have to pay."

Mr. Yakub Hasan:—" Are the lorries employed by other firms for carrying goods also exempt from this tax? "

The hon. the Raja of Bobbili:—" Yes, I think so."

Reintroduction of tolls for non-motor vehicles.

* 470 *Q.*—Mr. A. B. Shetty: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) what percentage of the toll fees was collected from motor and non-motor vehicles respectively in each of the three years preceding the year in which the abolition of tolls came into effect; and

(b) whether the Government have considered the question of reintroducing tolls for non-motor vehicles?

[a] Printed as Appendix I on pages 252-253 infra.

24th January 1933]

A.—(*a*) The Government have no information.

(*b*) The matter is under consideration.

Mr. A. B. SHETTY:—" With reference to the answer to clause (*a*) of this question, may I know whether the Government ever considered it necessary to obtain information in connexion with the Motor Vehicles Taxation Bill? "

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—" I do not think it is possible to have that information."

Mr. A. B. SHETTY:—" May I know whether, in connexion with the examination of the question of the reintroduction of tolls for non-motor vehicles, the Government think of obtaining this information?"

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—" I am afraid it is not possible to obtain this information as the receipts from motor vehicles are not separately shown in the books."

Mr. M. S. SRESHTA:—" May I know if even an approximate estimate cannot be got? "

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—" Even when the Motor Vehicles Taxation Bill was under consideration, the Government made an attempt to get this information, but it was found impossible to get it."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—" In answer to (*b*) it is stated that the Government are considering the matter. When they have not got the data on the basis of which they have to consider the matter, what is it that they are considering? "

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—" They have got sufficient data for total receipts, but not accurate information about the receipts from motor vehicles and non-motor vehicles separately."

Mr. M. S. SRESHTA:—" May I know whether approximate figures cannot be got from the various municipalities in connexion with this matter? "

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—" I am afraid, no."

Mr. M. S. SRESHTA:—" May I ask the hon. Minister to call for this information? "

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—" I will consider the question, but I am afraid it is not possible to get accurate information."

Mr. V. T. ARASU:—" May I know whether the Government have received representations from the public at large protesting against the introduction of tolls for non-motor vehicles? "

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—" Many representations have been received for and against. The question was placed before the Advisory Committee for Local and Municipal Affairs and a decision was taken."

[24th January 1933

Mr. V. T. Arasu:—" From whom were representations for the introduction of tolls received? Were they from the municipalities or from the public at large? "

The hon. the Raja of Bobbili:—" Representations were received from municipalities as well as from persons interested in the better upkeep of the roads."

Mr. V. T. Arasu:—" May I know the names of such persons, Sir? "

The hon. the Raja of Bobbili:—" I cannot give the names off-hand."

Unauthorized improvements to the water works at Trichinopoly.

* 471 *Q.*—Mr. K. Singam Ayyangar: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government are aware if the Chairman, Municipal Council, Trichinopoly, has started the work of the improvements to the Water Works, Trichinopoly, and incurred expenditure to a large extent without the sanction of the Sanitary Engineer and the Government; and

(*b*) if so, what action the Government propose to take in the matter ?

A.—(*a*) It has recently been brought to the notice of the Government that there is a scheme of improvements to the Water Works, Trichinopoly, under execution without technical sanction for the same having been accorded by the Sanitary Engineering Department.

(*b*) The matter is under the consideration of the Government.

Mr. K. Singam Ayyangar:—" May I ask the hon. Minister whether he will be pleased to instruct the Inspector of Municipal Councils not to make expenditure until the sanction of the Sanitary Engineer to Government is obtained? "

The hon. the Raja of Bobbili:—" Government recently got official information that some works have been undertaken and they called for report. As this report is not yet in their hands, it is difficult for them to say what their attitude would be."

Mr. K. Singam Ayyangar:—" I may assure the Government that expenditure is being incurred. When that is the case, may I ask whether the Government will not be pleased to ask their Inspector of Municipal Councils to stop the works at this stage at least? "

The hon. the Raja of Bobbili:—" We have called for information. The Government must first of all satisfy themselves that such unauthorized expenditure is being incurred."

Mr. K. Singam Ayyangar:—" May I know when the information will be placed before the Council? "

The hon. the Raja of Bobbili:—" It has been called for. It has not been received."

24th January 1933]

Agency Tracts

Control of education in the Agency tracts by the Revenue department.

* 472 *Q.*—Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state for how long the control of education in the Agency tracts has been vested in the Revenue department, and the advantages the new system has over the old one under which the control was vested in the Education department?

A.—The control of education in the Agency tracts was at no time vested solely in the officers of the Educational Department. It remained primarily with the Agents and the Special Assistant Agents who acted in consultation with the officers of the Educational Department. A separate Agency Educational Officer was assisting the Agency Commissioner, and later, the Agents until 1929, when the post was abolished. As it was found that the District Educational Officers could not efficiently perform the duties assigned to the Agency Educational Officer in addition to their work in the plains, the Government issued orders in December 1929 entrusting those duties so far as they related to elementary schools to the Special Assistant Agents, leaving the control of all secondary and training schools to the District Educational Officers concerned. The control of secondary and of training schools under Government management was, however, transferred to the Agents and the Special Assistant Agents, respectively, in 1931, the District Educational Officer's functions being confined to the periodical inspection of these institutions. District Educational Officers were able to spend little time in the Agency and were not in close touch with the special conditions in that area. Agents and Special Assistant Agents, on the other hand, frequently tour in the Agency and are well acquainted with the conditions of the schools and the educational needs of the inhabitants. They are, therefore, in a position to exercise better supervision over the schools.

Irrigation

The Tungabhadra Project.

* 473 *Q.*—Mr. G. Lakshmana Reddi: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) the progress made in the negotiations between the Madras Government and the Government of His Exalted Highness the Nizam regarding the long pending Tungabhadra Project;

(*b*) whether it is a fact that the Mettur Project is almost finished and, if not, whether the Government will state the time that is likely to be taken for the completion of all the works connected with the Mettur Project; and

[24th January 1933

(*c*) whether it is true that the Government propose to transfer the plant and materials used in the Mettur Project to commence the operations connected with the Tungabhadra Project?

A.—(*a*) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer to question No. 428.

(*b*) The Mettur dam works are expected to be completed by September 1934.

(*c*) It is too early to say whether this should be done.

Diwan Bahadur M. GOPALASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—" In reply to my question yesterday the hon. the Revenue Member was pleased to state that the Chief Engineer was on leave and that he was unable to meet him. May I know when the hon. Member may be expected to meet the Chief Engineer? "

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—" I am afraid the hon. Member did not quite hear what I said yesterday. What I said was that the Hyderabad Chief Engineer was in Europe and therefore the Madras Chief Engineer could not meet him. Our Chief Engineer has been in correspondence with him to make an arrangement for meeting him since he returned to Hyderabad. After I replied the hon. Member yesterday, I saw our Chief Engineer, and he informed me that he is arranging to proceed to Hyderabad on the 5th February and to meet the Hyderabad Chief Engineer on the 6th February. I have written to the Resident asking him if it is possible to hold a Conference on the 9th or 10th February, at which I could meet representatives of the Hyderabad Government and the two Chief Engineers could be present."

Mr. W. O. WRIGHT:—" May I ask the hon. the Revenue Member whether he will give the House an assurance that the economic possibilities of this will be considered before any expenditure is incurred on it by the Government? "

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—" The question has been constantly before the Government whether any of the plant or materials could be used for the Tungabhadra Project or the Bhavani Project."

Kattalai Bed Regulator and the High Level Channel scheme.

* 474 *Q.*—Mr. K. SINGAM AYYANGAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state with reference to the answer to question No. 358 given on 3rd November 1932—

(*a*) whether Rs. 20,37,250 represents the full amount of the estimate of the whole High Level Channel scheme or whether it is for only a part thereof;

(*b*) if the amount is only for a part, what the cost of the whole estimate will be and when the whole estimate will be ready;

(*c*) whether the works of the High Level Channel scheme are done piecemeal or whether they are entrusted on contract by tenders;

24th January 1933]

(*d*) if it is done piecemeal, to what extent and the reasons for the same; if it is by tender, the date for the receipt and disposal of the same;

(*e*) whether the Government propose to call for reports as to the progress of works done till now from the Special Division in charge of the Kattalai Bed Regulator and the High Level Channel scheme; and

(*f*) if there is balance of work in the Kattalai Bed Regulator whether the same has been given on contract by tender, and if so, when, and if not, why not ?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*).—The sum represents the full amount of the estimate of the whole Kattalai scheme.

(*c*) The works are split into convenient units and they are given out on contract. Tenders are called for in nearly all cases.

(*d*) In the case of some small masonry works tenders are not invited. In other cases where tenders are called for a fortnight to six weeks' time is given for submission of the tenders and they are disposed of immediately after receipt.

(*e*) Weekly progress reports are being received by the Chief Engineer. Government do not propose to call for them.

(*f*) The Government have accepted a tender for the work. Agreement with the successful tenderer will be concluded shortly.

Mr. K. Singam Ayyangar:—"May I know whether the Rs. 20 lakhs and odd represent the cost of the Kattalai Bed Regulator as well as the High Level Channel scheme?"

The hon. Sir Archibald Campbell:—"I should like to have notice of the question."

Irrigation projects in the Tinnevelly district considered by the Projects Division formed in 1921.

* 475 *Q.*—Mr. M. Devadasan: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state in regard to the irrigation projects in the Tinnevelly district—

(*a*) the names of all projects which have been considered by the Government till now;

(*b*) the names of those projects which have been examined since 1901, and the result of the investigation along with a brief statement of the area proposed to be benefited, the estimated cost and the reasons for the final orders in respect of each;

(*c*) whether the Projects Division formed in 1921 has considered any project in the Tinnevelly district; and

(*d*) whether any project is now under investigation or consideration ?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The information is given in the annexed statement [a].

(*c*) No. The Project Division was formed to examine only such projects as were then under consideration, with a view to

[a] Printed as Appendix II on pages 253–254 infra.

[24th January 1933

a final decision being taken on them. The Papanasam Reservoir project was not then ready for examination as gaugings were being taken. The Special Executive Engineer in charge of the Project Division made only a passing reference to it, and no others.

(*d*) Yes. The Papanasam project. Smaller schemes, viz., improvements to Marandai channel and extension of irrigation under Mandaikulam anicut and tank are under consideration by local officers.

Irrigation project for Papanasam, Tinnevelly district.

* 476 *Q.*—Mr. M. DEVADASAN: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Government have ordered the investigation of an irrigation project for Papanasam; and

(*b*) whether the Government propose to consult the Tinnevelly public before final orders are passed on this project?

A.—(*a*) The Superintending Engineer has been directed by the Chief Engineer to examine the rainfall records and report on the possibility of taking up the Papanasam reservoir project as an independent irrigation scheme.

(*b*) The question of consulting the ryots concerned will be considered.

Mr. M. DEVADASAN:—" With reference to clause (*a*) of this question, may I know how long the matter has been under the consideration of the Government? "

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—" I must ask for notice."

Progress of the Tank Restoration Scheme work in the Tinnevelly district.

* 477 *Q.*—Mr. M. DEVADASAN: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state with reference to the Tank Restoration Scheme work in the Tinnevelly district—

(*a*) the total area within the scope of the investigation with particulars for each basin, major and minor;

(*b*) the area that has been fully investigated up to now, with particulars as aforesaid;

(*c*) the works which have been executed in pursuance of the proposals and estimates prepared as a result of the investigation;

(*d*) the works for which estimates have been prepared, but not sanctioned for execution till now; and the works sanctioned and not executed;

(*e*) the works in respect of which execution is in progress; and

(*f*) what the Government propose to do to resume the investigation work which has been left incomplete?

24th January 1933]

A.—(*a*) *to* (*e*) A statement [a] giving the figures as they stood on 30th September 1932 is laid on the table. Later figures are not available.

(*f*) The question will be examined when a definite improvement in the financial position of the Province has established itself.

Repairs to the Marandai channel in the Tinnevelly district.

* 478 *Q.*—Mr. M. DEVADASAN: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Marandai channel and anicut under the Chittar river in the Tinnevelly district have been in a very bad state of disrepair for a number of decades;

(*b*) whether numerous representations have been made to various officers of the Government from time to time about the same;

(*c*) whether a memorial has been received from the Tinnevelly District Association about the critical condition of the current pishanam crops on over 500 acres of ryotwari wet lands under the channel;

(*d*) whether the Tank Restoration Scheme Party investigated the Marandai channel and anicut in or about 1926 and prepared an estimate for the repairs and improvement of the same;

(*e*) what the action, if any, taken by the Government so far is in regard to the execution of the work and when if at all the Government propose to take up the same;

(*f*) what the amounts of contribution are which the Government desire to obtain from the Uttumalai Estate and the Inamdar of Vellakal in respect of the estimated expense and what the basis is for the ascertainment of the same;

(*g*) what the steps taken so far either by negotiations or otherwise are to settle the question and the terms of contribution and what the result of the same is;

(*h*) what the replies are of the Uttumalai Estate and the Inamdar of Vellakal for the claims for contribution;

(*i*) whether legal opinion has been taken by the Government in regard to the same; and

(*j*) whether it is the intention of the Government to wait until the question of contribution is settled before taking up the work of repairs of the Marandai channel?

A.—(*a*) No. The channel was repaired in 1892 and 1904.

(*b*) Yes.

(*c*) Yes.

(*d*) The Government have not the information but an estimate for improvements and repairs was submitted in 1930.

[a] Printed as Appendix III on page 255 infra.

[24th January 1933

(e) The Government approved the estimates in 1931 but the execution of the work is in abeyance.

(f) The estimates are to be revised as additional repairs and improvements are contemplated. The amounts of contribution will be fixed after the actual amounts of the estimates are known. The basis for the apportionment of contribution is the acreage belonging to the several interests irrigated by the channel—viz., ryotwari, zamindari and inam.

(g) The proposals of the Public Works Department have been sent to the Zamindar of the estate for acceptance and the local officers have been asked to expedite the settlement.

(h) The Uttumalai Estate is willing to pay the contribution. The Inamdar of Vellegal has refused to pay.

(i) Yes.

(j) The works contemplated are in the nature of (1) improvements and (2) repairs. The orders issued in 1931 directed the execution of the repairs forthwith as no question of contribution was involved therein. Now the estimates for both the improvements and repairs are undergoing revision as additional works are considered necessary. The repairs will be put in hand immediately after the revised estimate is sanctioned, and the improvements will be put in hand after the question of contribution is settled.

Mr. M. Devadasan:—" With reference to (d), may I know whether the Government will be pleased to call for the information? "

The hon. Sir Archibald Campbell:—" Yes, Sir. I will call for the information."

Memorandum presented by the Tinnevelly District Association to the Executive Engineer regarding disafforestation in the Singampatti zamin hills.

* 479 Q.—Mr. M. Devadasan: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the Tinnevelly District Association presented a memorandum to the Executive Engineer at the Ryots' Conference held in Tinnevelly on 21st November 1932, about disafforestation in the Singampatti zamin hills and the State hills in the catchment basin of the upper portion of the Tambraparni river;

(b) whether the Executive Engineer promised to investigate the question;

(c) what action has been taken till now and what the result of the same is; and

(d) whether the Government will be pleased to publish the report of the investigation?

24th January 1933]

A.—(*a*) *to* (*c*) The Government have no information on the subject except that they have perused the following paragraph in a report of the Irrigation Committee of the Tinnevelly District Association, dated 2nd January 1933, of which a copy has been received by Government:—

"*Paragraph XV.*—In the Ryots' Irrigation Conference the Executive Engineer was requested to investigate the question of disafforestation that was reported to be going on to a considerable and alarming extent primarily in the Singampati zamin hills and to a certain extent in the Government hills also forming the catchment basin of the upper portion of the Tambraparni river. He has agreed to do it. The Committee will keep itself in touch with the result of the investigation and consider if any further steps have to be taken."

(*d*) The question will be considered if a report is received.

Minor Irrigation

Maramat to the Rajakalmangalam tank and channel in the Tinnevelly district.

* 480 *Q.*—Mr. M. DEVADASAN: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether Rajakalmangalam tank and channel in Tinnevelly district have had any general maramat at any time since the British advent;

(*b*) whether the ryots under that tank or under Sengulam lower down have petitioned the authorities concerned for the repair of the same;

(*c*) how long these petitions have been pending;

(*d*) whether the Government realize the imminence and urgency of the repairs prayed for;

(*e*) if so, what action the authorities have taken in the matter; and

(*f*) whether the tank and channel are under the Minor Irrigation Department or the Public Works Department?

A.—(*a*) *to* (*e*) The Government have not the information. No petitions have been received by the Government in recent years. A report has been called for.

(*f*) They are minor irrigation works in charge of the Revenue Department.

Mr. M. DEVADASAN:—"May I know whether the Government propose to give any help for the repair of this anicut? They say that they have no information. Will they be pleased to call for it?"

The hon. Sir ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL:—"We have called for a report, Sir."

[24th January 1933

Land Revenue Administration

Objections to the transfer of S. Nos. 55, 56 and 57 of Elundiraikondan village from dry to wet.

* 481 *Q.*—Mr. M. D. T. Ranganatha Mudaliyar: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) what the grounds of objections are that were raised by the ayacutdars to the transfer of S. Nos. 55, 56 and 57 and other lands referred to in Collector's R.O.C. No. A-4-3579/30, dated 3rd October 1931, and published in Council Proceedings, dated 3rd November 1931, and which of them were found to be untrue or frivolous; and

(*b*) whether the Tahsildar's report was based on his personal opinion or on enquiry and inspection?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The Government have not the information but have called for a report.

Territorial Changes

Proposal for the abolition of the Kovvur Revenue division, West Godavari district.

* 482 *Q.*—Mr. C. Indriah: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether there is any proposal before the Government for the abolition of the Kovvur Revenue division of the West Godavari district;

(*b*) if so, in what stage the matter is;

(*c*) whether the Collector of the district and the Kovvur Revenue Divisional Officer were consulted in the matter, and if so, what their views are; and

(*d*) whether any objection petitions were sent up to the Government by the people and if so, whether the objections were considered by the Government?

A.—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) & (*c*) The Board of Revenue has been asked to publish the proposal for public criticism. The Government are awaiting the Board's report.

(*d*) A memorial objecting to the proposed abolition of the division was presented to the hon. the Revenue Member by a deputation of the residents of Kovvur taluk. It will be considered by the Government when the Board's report is received.

Mr. C. Indriah:—Will the hon. the Revenue Member be pleased to state whether the Collector of West Godavari and the Revenue Divisional Officer, Kovvur, were consulted in the matter?"

The hon. Sir Archibald Campbell:—"A copy of the memorial presented to me was given to the Collector and it will no doubt be considered by the Collector when submitting his report."

24th January 1933]

Administration of Justice

Supersession of the Panchayat Court at Chidambaram.

* 483 *Q.*—Swami A. S. SAHAJANANDAM: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Panchayat Court constituted in 1931 at Chidambaram has now been superseded; if so, what the main grounds are for doing so;

(*b*) whether any defect was pointed out in the description of villages lying within its jurisdiction, and as notified in the Gazette;

(*c*) who is responsible for the said defect;

(*d*) whether it was rectified by a subsequent order of the Government; if so, why did not the Court function;

(*e*) even after the Panchayat Court was formed and began to function, whether the village munsif of Chidambaram continued to try cases within the same jurisdiction contrary to the orders of the Government;

(*f*) why did not the village munsif hand over papers of pending suits to the Panchayat Court in spite of the orders made by the Tahsildar;

(*g*) whether he was suspended for the disobedience of orders by the Tahsildar;

(*h*) how was he then restored;

(*i*) whether there was any representation by the public that two or more courts are to be established instead of one as originally constituted;

(*j*) whether there was any delay in the disposal of cases in a single court;

(*k*) whether the suggestion of grouping villages as they stand at present proceeded from the Revenue Divisional Officer or from others;

(*l*) whether the Revenue Divisional Officer passed any orders not to entertain or try cases by the Panchayat Court after notification was duly corrected and made and what his reasons are;

(*m*) how many cheris were included within the jurisdiction of the Panchayat Court already formed;

(*n*) how many members of the said court belonged to the Adi-Dravida community;

(*o*) how many cheris are included in the municipal area as now defined in G.O. Ms. No. 3454, dated 20th September 1932;

(*p*) how many of them are excluded from the said municipal area;

(*q*) why is a village court alone recommended for each of the villages or their groups as defined in the said Government Order, outside the municipal limits;

(*r*) why was Kuthankoil village omitted in the present proposal; and

(*s*) whether the village munsif of the village holds the presidentship of the existing panchayat court ?

A.—(*a*) Yes, the main ground being that the notification issued in 1931 was vague and doubts were felt as to whether the jurisdiction of the Panchayat Court as constituted included the municipal area of Chidambaram.

(*b*) It was brought to the notice of Government that the notification issued in G.O. No. 5131, Law (General), dated the 6th December 1930, did not expressly include Chidambaram municipal village.

(*c*) The proposal for the constitution of the panchayat court in question was made by the Revenue Divisional Officer, Chidambaram (Mr. F. Lobo).

(*d*) A notification reconstituting the Court was issued only in September 1932. This Court has been ordered to function with effect from the 15th December 1932.

(*e*) The hon. Member presumably refers to the Panchayat Court which was formed in 1931. The village munsif continued to try cases till March 1932, when order was issued to him not to try civil cases.

(*f*), (*g*), (*h*) & (*l*) The village munsif was given time till 31st March 1932 to arrange the records for transmission to the Panchayat Court. Subsequently, a mahazar was received by the Revenue Divisional Officer requesting him to stay his order directing the village munsif to hand over the records of the Panchayat Court. Thereupon, he issued orders both to the village munsif and the Panchayat Court not to try cases arising in the municipal area till the question of jurisdiction was finally settled by the Government.

The Tahsildar of Chidambaram issued an order suspending the village munsif for failure to hand over the records of pending civil suits to the Panchayat Court even though he was not competent to issue such an order. The Revenue Divisional Officer did not consider the order justifiable and did not approve of it.

(*i*) No.

(*j*) No delays were brought to notice.

(*k*) Vide answer to clause (*c*) above.

(*l*) See above.

(*m*) Eight.

(*n*) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer to Legislative Council question No. 242.

(*o*) Three.

(*p*) None.

(*q*) Panchayat Courts were considered unnecessary for them as they are petty villages with small population.

24th January 1933]

(r) A village court has been constituted under section 6 (1) of the Madras Village Courts Act, 1888, for the group of Kuthankoil and Settimuthu villages.

(s) The village headman of Kuthankoil was the President of the court, as constituted in 1931.

Rao Sahib V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI:—" May I know from the hon. the Law Member whether the Government is aware that while there were two representatives of the Adi-Dravida community in the Panchayat Court as constituted in the past, there are none now? " 11-30 a.m.

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" I am not aware of it. Even if I were, Government cannot help it, because as far as I can remember the Government have no power of nominating any member from the Adi-Dravida community."

Mr. M. DEVADASAN:—" May I know whether the Government propose to appoint members from among the Depressed Classes to the Panchayat Court? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" I am not aware as I said whether Government have power of nomination to the Panchayat Court. If they have it, I shall consider my hon. Friend's suggestion."

Rao Sahib V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI:—" Is the Government aware that no cheries have been included in the jurisdiction of the Panchayat Court as reconstituted and how is it possible for any member of the Adi-Dravida community to be elected to the Panchayat Court as now reconstituted? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" There are some cheries included in the jurisdiction of the Panchayat Court even according to the present notification."

Mr. M. DEVADASAN:—" May I know whether the reconstitution of the Panchayat Court has been injurious to the interests of the depressed classes? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" No, Sir."

Prisons and Prisoners

Quarantine of prisoners received into the Jail.

* 484 Q.—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) the period for which new prisoners received into the jail are ordinarily kept in quarantine before they are allowed to stay with other prisoners and whether this period was exceeded in the case of Mr. T. P. Alwar of Masulipatam;

(b) the reasons which ordinarily govern transfer of prisoners from one jail to another and what those reasons were in the case of Mr. Alwar for his transfer to Bellary Jail;

(c) how long he was kept in quarantine in the Bellary Jail and whether he was kept there until the expiry of the term of sentence;

(*d*) the amount of fine, if any, imposed on him as part of his sentence and recovered respectively and the date on which he should have been released from the jail, strictly according to rules; and

(*e*) whether he was actually released four days later than the due date and if so, why?

A.—(*a*) The hon. Member is referred to rule 243 of the Madras Jail Manual.

(*b*) The hon. Member is referred to rules 468 to 472 of the Madras Jail Manual. Convict T. P. Alwar was transferred to the Central Jail, Bellary, on disciplinary grounds.

(*c*) He was confined in the quarantine from 24th April 1932 to 15th October 1932, i.e., throughout the period of his detention in the Central Jail, Bellary.

(*d*) The answer to the first part is Rs. 200 and Rs. 64 respectively, and the answer to the second part is 11th October 1932.

(*e*) He was released on 15th October 1932 as intimation of the fact of recovery of the sum of Rs. 64 was received by the Jail Superintendent only on that date.

Payment of passage money by Palempadiyan Aydroo, a Mappilla prisoner, for his return journey.

* 485 *Q.*—B. Pocker Sahib Bahadur: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that Palempadiyan Aydroo, a Mappilla, convicted of offence connected with the Malabar rebellion of 1921 was forced to remain in the Andamans for four years after the expiry of his term of imprisonment owing to his inability to pay the debts due to the Government;

(*b*) whether his family was taken to the Andamans according to the Andaman Colonization Scheme at Government expense;

(*c*) what the amount advanced to him under the scheme was;

(*d*) what amount he owed to the Government on the expiry of his term;

(*e*) whether he represented to the authorities at the Andamans that he was unable to pay the debts and that he should be permitted to go back to Malabar without paying such debts;

(*f*) if so, whether he was given such permission;

(*g*) whether he requested the authorities at the Andamans to give free passage to his family to be taken back to Malabar with him and what the order of the authorities was;

(*h*) whether it is a fact that he was permitted to leave the Andamans only on his discharging the whole debt due to the Government; and

(*i*) whether it is a fact that he was not provided by the Government with free passage either for himself or for his family on his leaving the Andamans and that he had to find funds for the passage for himself and his family ?

A.—(*a*) *to* (*i*) The information has been called for.

24th January 1933]

(r) A village court has been constituted under section 6 (1) of the Madras Village Courts Act, 1888, for the group of Kuthankoil and Settimuthu villages.

(s) The village headman of Kuthankoil was the President of the court, as constituted in 1931.

Rao Sahib V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI:—" May I know from the hon. the Law Member whether the Government is aware that while there were two representatives of the Adi-Dravida community in the Panchayat Court as constituted in the past, there are none now? " 11-30 a.m.

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" I am not aware of it. Even if I were, Government cannot help it, because as far as I can remember the Government have no power of nominating any member from the Adi-Dravida community."

Mr. M. DEVADASAN:—" May I know whether the Government propose to appoint members from among the Depressed Classes to the Panchayat Court? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" I am not aware as I said whether Government have power of nomination to the Panchayat Court. If they have it, I shall consider my hon. Friend's suggestion."

Rao Sahib V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI:—" Is the Government aware that no cheries have been included in the jurisdiction of the Panchayat Court as reconstituted and how is it possible for any member of the Adi-Dravida community to be elected to the Panchayat Court as now reconstituted? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" There are some cheries included in the jurisdiction of the Panchayat Court even according to the present notification."

Mr. M. DEVADASAN:—" May I know whether the reconstitution of the Panchayat Court has been injurious to the interests of the depressed classes? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" No, Sir."

Prisons and Prisoners

Quarantine of prisoners received into the Jail.

* 484 Q.—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) the period for which new prisoners received into the jail are ordinarily kept in quarantine before they are allowed to stay with other prisoners and whether this period was exceeded in the case of Mr. T. P. Alwar of Masulipatam;

(b) the reasons which ordinarily govern transfer of prisoners from one jail to another and what those reasons were in the case of Mr. Alwar for his transfer to Bellary Jail;

(c) how long he was kept in quarantine in the Bellary Jail and whether he was kept there until the expiry of the term of sentence;

[24th January 1933

Mr. G. LAKSHMANA REDDI:—" Is it not due to want of butter-milk to him? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" It is not possible for me to say that now."

Law and Order—General

Alleged lathi charge on satyagrahis in Bezwada on 14th November 1932.

* 487 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that Mannu Kanakaya, Kadiyal Pichaya and six others were severely beaten with lathis when they were peacefully offering satyagraha before the Andhra Ratna Bhavana in Bezwada, on 14th November 1932;

(*b*) whether it is a fact that several of the volunteers fell down unconscious and were dragged by the Police into the Bhavana;

(*c*) whether it is a fact that they were treated in the Government Hospital, Bezwada; if so, whether the hon. the Home Member will be pleased to state from the hospital records as to the number and nature of the injuries received by each;

(*d*) whether any attempt was made to arrest the persons without inflicting injuries on them; and

(*e*) what action the Government have taken or propose to take in the matter?

A.—(*a*) The eight persons referred to attempted to enter into the Andhra Ratna Bhavan, a place notified and taken possession of under the Unlawful Association Ordinance (IV of 1932) and remaining in the possession of Government. The Police prevented entry into the building. A crowd assembled and in order to prevent a breach of the peace the volunteers were ordered to disperse. On their refusal to disperse, when warned, the volunteers were dispersed by force.

(*b*) In the act of forcible dispersal some of the volunteers fell down and refused to move. They were taken into the building until the arrival of a bus. They did not fall down unconscious.

(*c*) They were rendered first aid in the Government hospital and immediately discharged. The Government have asked the District Magistrate to report the number and nature of the injuries received.

(*d*) As the volunteers refused to disperse and in the opinion of the Police officer in charge there was a danger of a breach of the peace, forcible dispersal was considered to be the best way of dealing with the situation to prevent worse consequences.

(*e*) None.

24th January 1933]

Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT :—" May I know whether the hon. the Home Member will be pleased to call for a report from the District Magistrate and place it on the table of the House? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur.—" The suggestion of the hon. Member, will be considered."

Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT :—" May I know whether any attempt was made to arrest the volunteers before they were beaten? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :— "It is stated in the answer. The Police had to use force to prevent a breach of the peace."

Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT :—" May I know as to which was about a cause of breach of the peace, whether the volunteers or the crowd that was collected there? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :— " I suppose both."

Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT :—" May I know why then the volunteers were asked to be dispersed and not the crowd? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :— " Because the volunteers were causing trouble."

Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT :—" May I know whether it was not a fact that the Police Officer wanted to punish the volunteers and insult them rather than arrest and bring them before the Court? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MAHOMED USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :— " I do not think it is so."

[*Note.*—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

II.—ADJOURNMENT MOTION *RE* THE POSTPONEMENT OF DISTRICT AND TALUK BOARDS ELECTIONS IN THE KISTNA DISTRICT.

* Rai Sahib C. KOLANDA REDDI :—" I beg to move the adjournment motion that stands in my name and which runs thus—

' *That the business of the House be adjourned for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, to wit, the Government Order passed on December 20th, 1932, postponing the District Boards and Taluk Boards elections in the Kistna district from 3rd January to 1st February 1933* '."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN :—" I beg to second it."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I think the motion is in order, and I want to know whether any hon. Member objects to it.

" No objection having been taken, I fix 4 o'clock this afternoon for the moving of the motion."

[24th January 1933

III.—A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS LOCAL BOARDS ACT, 1920 (BILL No. 25 OF 1932)—HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR'S MESSAGE.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I have to communicate to the House a Message from His Excellency the Governor which runs as follows :—

' *On an examination of the Bill to amend the Madras Local Boards Act,* 1920 (*Bill No.* 25 *of* 1932) *as passed by the Legislative Council at its meeting held on the* 1st *November* 1932 *and of the provisions of the Act, I find that a consequential amendment to Section* 49 *of the Act should be made in order to make the new provisions fully workable. I accordingly return the Bill to the Legislative Council under Section* 81-*A* (1) *of the Government of India Act, for its reconsideration. Some drafting amendments also appear to me to be necessary in the Bill. Opportunity may be taken to make such amendments.*' "

IV.—A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS DISTRICT MUNICIPALITIES ACT, 1920 (BILL No. 26 OF 1932).

Clause 6.

* Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" Sir, the House was good enough to give me permission yesterday to take up this Bill early this day and in the evening of yesterday the respective representatives of the various parties met together and, I am glad to say, came to some satisfactory conclusion. Mr. K. R. Venkatarama Ayyar said that this was a non-party measure. I differ from him and say that this is an all party measure, because representatives of all sections of the House took part in it in a very hearty and sympathetic manner. And I am thankful to say that their labours have not been wasted and are likely to prove beneficial. If I am allowed to anticipate a little, I shall briefly refer to the agreed arrangements of yesterday evening. It was urged that this Bill is possibly a penal measure meant for application to the unsatisfactory municipalities. But there was never any such idea. It is really to enable the municipal bodies to conduct their administration with increasing satisfaction that this Bill has been brought forward. There is no intention whatsoever to attach any stigma to any municipality.

" One question raised at the meeting was whether the number of municipalities included in the Schedule is not too large. We had fixed the income test as two lakhs of rupees and included all municipalities having an income over that figure. It was urged that in consideration of the resources of certain municipalities and other causes, it may not be possible to start straightaway appointing Commissioners for all the 26 municipalities included in the Schedule. Now we have reduced the number to 10 by raising the limit of the income to 3 lakhs of rupees instead of two lakhs. Some members on the opposite side have given notice of motions to reduce the number to 12 or 14 but we thought that a more satisfactory solution for all their objections was to raise the limit of income to 3 lakhs of rupees.

" It was urged that the chairmen of municipalities were ignored altogether in the matter of giving contracts. We have taken their

24th January 1933] [Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar]

claims into account and agreed that the disposal of contracts should be by a committee consisting of the chairman, the commissioner and also a councillor to be elected by the Council.

"There was a fear entertained that if we do not specify the services from which should be appointed the commissioners, outside people may be introduced as commissioners for party purposes. To remove such misapprehensions, we have agreed that the selection for commissionerships should be only from Government, or Local Fund or Municipal service.

"These are the changes which we expect, would disarm all opposition to the Bill. We have restored Schedule IX restricting the number of municipalities for compulsory commissionerships to 10 instead of 26. With this explanation, I move

'*that in clause* 6 *new section* 12-*C for sub-sections* (1) *and* (2) *the following be substituted*:—

"(1) *A commissioner shall be appointed by the Local Government in the case of each municipality included in Schedule IX and in the case of any other municipality notified by the Local Government in this behalf. Every notification issued under this sub-section shall specify the reasons therefor.*" '

"You will see, Sir, that, before the Government decide to appoint commissioners to certain municipalities, they will have to specify the reasons for their action, and these reasons should also be recorded in writing.

"I hope, Sir, these modifications will meet with the approval of the House."

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN:—"I second the motion."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The question is—

'in clause 6, new section 12-C, *for* sub-sections (1) and (2), *substitute* the following:—

"(1) A commissioner shall be appointed by the Local Government in the case of each of the municipalities included in Schedule IX and in the case of any other municipality notified by the Local Government in this behalf. Every notification issued under this sub-section shall specify the reasons therefor." '

Khan Bahadur Mahmud SCHAMNAD SAHIB Bahadur:—"May I rise to a point of order, Sir. The motion was already passed by this House and Schedule IX has been included in the Bill. Is the hon. Member in order in reopening the subject?"

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I think there is some point in what Mr. Schamnad said. But when there is an agreed motion before the House it is up to the House to correct any mistakes, or to bring in new amendments, I therefore think that exigencies require that this motion should be admitted. Therefore I allow the motion. I do not think there is any point in the point of order raised by Mr. Schamnad Sahib."

* Mr. K. R. VENKATARAMA AYYAR:—"I thank you, Sir, for allowing this new clause to be moved notwithstanding the technical objection raised by my hon. Friend, Mr. Schamnad Sahib. It gives

effect to the arrangement made between the representatives of the various groups of the Council. Rather than let this Bill be buried as the Leader on our side apprehended, it is better that it has been resurrected in this form to-day, because instead of allowing all municipalities to suffier without the advantage of salaried whole-time commissioners to attend to their daily administrative duties it is better at least to have such a wholesome provision at least in the case of some big municipalities like Madura and nine others.

11-45 a.m. "At the same time it is good that whenever the Government notify other municipalities also for appointment of commissioners, they should not do so arbitrarily and freakishly but support their notification by a statement of reasons. It is hoped that the experience gained in the case of the ten municipalities whose revenues amount to more than three lakhs of rupees in each case will be a good guide in the light of which the Government will exercise its discretion in making notifications. I think, therefore, without further discussion this new clause may be put to the vote."

* Mr. C. Basu Dev:—"Sir, I am told that after my amendment was passed yesterday and after the threat of Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar to drop the Bill, there was a conference of the leaders of the various parties at which an agreement was arrived at as to the further course of the Bill. I am not now going to raise any objection to a reconsideration of the question that was decided yesterday. But in fairness to myself I must say that I am very much in favour of every municipality in the Province having an executive officer, but I had to modify my desire in view of the opposition of some of the hon. Members to that idea. When I moved an amendment to delete the schedule my idea was to avoid the hardship that would certainly be caused to the present incumbents in certain municipalities. I therefore proposed to vest the discretion in the Government to appoint an executive officer to any municipality which they think necessary in the hope that in making such an appointment they would consider the question of security of the present municipal officials. As the hon. the Chief Minister pointed out, we are not vesting in the Government any extraordinary power; they have already got the power to supersede municipalities and what we do is to invest them with a lesser power to appoint an executive officer to any municipality where, in the opinion of the Government, there is maladministration or there is sufficiently heavy work to warrant such an appointment. I do not understand the fears which certain hon. Members entertain about this discretion being vested in the Government. I do not think any civilized Government much less the Government of which the hon. the Chief Minister is the head will make such appointments without any sense of proportion or decency or without regard to the actual requirements of the case. I have no such doubts either with regard to this Government or any other Government which may come hereafter.

"I am glad that Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar has tried to alleviate the hardships that might be caused to the present incumbents by the appointment of executive officers. He has suggested that executive

officers should be drawn also from the officials who are already employed in the municipalities. The municipal official as a rule is a good and efficient person and deserves every consideration and protection. The post of an executive officer will be the aim of his ambition and I am sure he will try his best to merit that appointment by honest, good and efficient service. In this connexion I should like to read to the House the tribute paid to the efficient work done by the municipal employees generally by no less a person than Sir Muhammad Habibulla who had devoted a whole lifetime to the administration of the Vellore Municipality. In the message which he recently sent to the Fifth Provincial Municipal Officials' Conference, he says:

'It is with great pleasure that I am able to bear testimony to the great zeal, interest and integrity with which the municipal officials as a class have generally discharged their onerous and often unpleasant duties and have, with great credit, held their own against any other class of public servants.'

"I hope, Sir, that the Government will give this opinion the weight it deserves and take note also of the general wish of this House to recognize the services which municipal employees have rendered and provide for the executive officers to be drawn also from the ranks of these efficient and experienced men. With these words, I have great pleasure in supporting the amendment. One word more and I am done. Mr. Venkatarama Ayyar in supporting the amendment or rather the agreed proposition referred to some ten municipalities to which executive officers should be appointed. I am afraid the agreed proposition does not refer to any particular number of municipalities. I suppose Mr. Venkatarama Ayyar was only giving out his own opinion and not referring to any particular proposition before the House."

The amendment was put and carried.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Before we proceed further I wish to inform the House that I do not propose to accept any further amendments to this Bill, because we have already got too many amendments. If at all any new amendments are necessary hereafter they must be amendments agreed to by all sections of the House."

* Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"Sir, I move—

'*that sub-sections* (3) *to* (8) *be renumbered as sub-sections* (2) *to* (7) *respectively*.'

"This is only a consequential amendment."

Mr. A. M. BHANOJI RAO:—"I second it."

The amendment was put and carried.

* Mr. C. BASU DEV:—"Sir, with regard to your ruling that you will not be prepared to receive any further amendments unless they are agreed to by all sections of the House, I have to submit that I do not know whether the proposition agreed to by the leaders of the parties lays down exactly the number of municipalities to be included in the schedule. Mr. Venkatarama Ayyar referred to the number of municipalities as being ten; probably he wants to fix the income limit at three lakhs. I do not think that question has been decided. Anyhow, I should like to move an amendment fixing the income limit at five lakhs."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The matter will be considered when the question arises."

* Mr. E. CONRAN SMITH:—"Sir, I move the amendment standing in my name. It is purely a drafting amendment. It deals with the old sub-section (4) which has now become sub-section (3) in view of the amendment moved by Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. The amendment reads:—

'For *sub-section* (3) *of new section* 12-*C*, substitute *the following sub-section, namely*:—

"(3) *No person shall be appointed to be a commissioner and no commissioner shall continue to hold office as such, after he has attained the age of fifty-five.*"'

"The intention of the amendment is merely to make the drafting better and the intention clearer. I therefore move the amendment."

Mr. T. SUNDARA RAO NAYUDU:—"I second the amendment."

The amendment was put and carried.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"I beg to move—

'*that the following be added as sub-clause* (8):—

"*The commissioner shall be appointed from among persons who are in active Government, Municipal or Local Fund service.*"'"

Mr. K. R. VENKATARAMA AYYAR:—"I second it."

* Mr. C. BASU DEV:—"Sir, in supporting the amendment I wish to omit the words 'local fund.' The selection should be confined to persons who are in Government or Municipal services. There is no necessity at all to consider the claims of employees in district and taluk boards while there are many efficient employees in the municipalities themselves."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"Sir, I do not agree with the spirit of the amendment. It is very just and fair that we should give a chance to those who are employed in the Government and municipalities, but in our enthusiasm to give a chance to those who have gained experience in municipalities and local boards and rendered good service, we should not prevent equally competent men from outside from being appointed as executive officers. I would therefore suggest that for the word 'shall' the word 'may' may be substituted. If that is done, there will be provision for the appointment of competent men from outside the ranks of those already in Government or municipal service. This would only be in the interests of the efficient administration of the municipalities. We should not confine the selection of executive officers to employees of the Government or the municipalities. I therefore oppose the amendment."

12 noon. Diwan Bahadur M. GOPALASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"Sir, I also oppose the amendment. With your leave, may I amend the amendment by inserting this clause? 'The Local Government in making the appointment of a Commissioner shall give preference to persons already in municipal service who are duly qualified for the post.' Such a

24th January 1933] [Mr. M. Gopalaswami Mudaliyar]

provision is necessary particularly because there are a number of municipal servants who are duly qualified and who have put in long service. In some municipalities there are experienced Revenue officers; in several municipalities there are capable managers. I think they can discharge very efficiently the duties of commissioner. It is for this reason that I move my amendment, namely, that the Government should give preference to those who are already in municipal service if they are duly qualified for the post."

* Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—" Sir, I rise to support the amendment moved by my hon. Friend, Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. I shall attempt to answer one or two points raised by my hon. Friend representing the Central Districts Muhammadan constituency. The amendment seeks only to explain the intention of the author of the Bill. The mover of the Bill explained on the floor of this House just a quarter of an hour ago that it was not his intention to appoint these commissioners from outside the Government or the municipal service. But in the drafting of that intention, there seems to be some loophole for appointments being made from outside these two services. It is now the intention of the proposer of this amendment to make that point clear by specifying that the appointments should be confined to these two services. There are two reasons why it is necessary that these appointments must be confined to these two services alone. The first thing for which we are trying to appoint executive officers is to relieve non-official chairmen not only from the heaviness of the work but also from the liability of their carrying on the administration. Therefore it is necessary that the persons who are going to be appointed and who are going to shoulder this responsible duty should be drawn from certain recognized classes of servants. If persons are going to be appointed from outside these two services, it is just possible that some young man who might possess the ordinary or the general qualifications, might be chosen as an executive officer by the Party in Power. Then it is likely that inasmuch as the period of service is limited, namely, three years, you may not be able to get very competent men. The person appointed from outside these services can accept the appointment only as a stop-gap for further promotions and further prospects in life. Therefore you cannot expect young men to be in municipal service even for a salary of Rs. 800 without looking for further prospects. That would only mean that we are trying to appoint executive officers only for the latters' convenience and not for the efficient management of the municipalities. There are men in the municipal service itself who are putting forth all their energy and attention in order to see that the Local Self-Government institutions are managed beyond cavil and criticism. Another reason why it is necessary that these appointments should be confined to these services is there are already a large number of competent managers of local bodies. By the appointment of these commissioners, they would be relegated to a subordinate position, if they are not given these appointments. It is only fair that chances should be given to those persons who have put in long number of years' service in municipal institutions and who have helped non-official chairmen in the efficient

management of these municipalities. They are looking forward to some prospects when you are going to create these new appointments as commissioners. If the choice is extended not only to Government servants and municipal servants but to outsiders also, these municipal servants who have been helping non-official chairmen in the efficient discharge of their duties, will stand very little chance. This amendment is both in the interest of those who are already in municipal service—there are already competent men in at least three or four big municipalities—and in the interest of those in Government service. The reason why I like that Government servants should be connected with these municipal institutions as executive officers, is this. It is supposed that Government servants are competent to manage such institutions properly. There is a certain amount of efficiency in Government service and they will be eligible for being appointed as executive officers; they will be able to manage these institutions properly. If a new man is going to be appointed as an executive officer and if he is going to gain experience at the risk and sacrifice of municipal administration, then there is no use of appointing executive officers. It is only because you want efficient men, because you want men whose ability has been tried and whose character and honesty are beyond reproach, you are going in for these executive officers. We expect these qualifications from those who are actually in service. For these reasons I commend this amendment for the acceptance of the House. It may be a matter of some error that my hon. Friend, Mr. Basheer Ahmed, was not informed of the agreement which we came to recently. If it is an error and if he considers it to be a serious one, I beg to apologize on behalf of my Leader who is not present just now."

* The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI:—" Sir, there seems to be some misconception as regards the intention of the Select Committee or of the Government in the matter of selection of candidates for the proposed service. As far as I am aware, it was never the intention of the Select Committee to recruit outsiders. The only idea was to take in Government servants in cases where competent municipal employees were not available. As far as the Government are concerned, they have not got any surplus officers and they can be spared only at considerable inconvenience. I am sure that, when a competent municipal employee is available, his claims will certainly be considered. But I am afraid that, as the amendment is now worded, it will not be possible to accept a hard and fast rule that in every case preference should be given to Government servants."

Diwan Bahadur M. GOPALASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—" Sir, in view of the assurance given by the hon. the Chief Minister that, in several cases where there are persons in municipal service who are qualified by their experience and by their ability, they would be preferred, I do not want to put my amendment in the statute. I withdraw my amendment and support the amendment of my hon. Friend, Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar."

Mr. C. BASU DEV:—" I do not press my amendment in view of the remarks made by my hon. Friend, Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti."

III.—A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS LOCAL BOARDS ACT, 1920 (BILL No. 25 OF 1932)—HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR'S MESSAGE.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I have to communicate to the House a Message from His Excellency the Governor which runs as follows :—

' *On an examination of the Bill to amend the Madras Local Boards Act,* 1920 (*Bill No.* 25 *of* 1932) *as passed by the Legislative Council at its meeting held on the* 1st *November* 1932 *and of the provisions of the Act, I find that a consequential amendment to Section* 49 *of the Act should be made in order to make the new provisions fully workable. I accordingly return the Bill to the Legislative Council under Section* 81-*A* (1) *of the Government of India Act, for its reconsideration. Some drafting amendments also appear to me to be necessary in the Bill. Opportunity may be taken to make such amendments.*' "

IV.—A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS DISTRICT MUNICIPALITIES ACT, 1920 (BILL No. 26 OF 1932).

Clause 6.

* Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" Sir, the House was good enough to give me permission yesterday to take up this Bill early this day and in the evening of yesterday the respective representatives of the various parties met together and, I am glad to say, came to some satisfactory conclusion. Mr. K. R. Venkatarama Ayyar said that this was a non-party measure. I differ from him and say that this is an all party measure, because representatives of all sections of the House took part in it in a very hearty and sympathetic manner. And I am thankful to say that their labours have not been wasted and are likely to prove beneficial. If I am allowed to anticipate a little, I shall briefly refer to the agreed arrangements of yesterday evening. It was urged that this Bill is possibly a penal measure meant for application to the unsatisfactory municipalities. But there was never any such idea. It is really to enable the municipal bodies to conduct their administration with increasing satisfaction that this Bill has been brought forward. There is no intention whatsoever to attach any stigma to any municipality.

" One question raised at the meeting was whether the number of municipalities included in the Schedule is not too large. We had fixed the income test as two lakhs of rupees and included all municipalities having an income over that figure. It was urged that in consideration of the resources of certain municipalities and other causes, it may not be possible to start straightaway appointing Commissioners for all the 26 municipalities included in the Schedule. Now we have reduced the number to 10 by raising the limit of the income to 3 lakhs of rupees instead of two lakhs. Some members on the opposite side have given notice of motions to reduce the number to 12 or 14 but we thought that a more satisfactory solution for all their objections was to raise the limit of income to 3 lakhs of rupees.

" It was urged that the chairmen of municipalities were ignored altogether in the matter of giving contracts. We have taken their

that there will be grave complications in such matters in the municipalities concerned. I trust therefore that the House will recognize the necessity of placing these subordinates under the commissioner. I am sorry I cannot accept the amendment of Mr. Bhanoji Rao."

12-15 p m * Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—" Sir, I am sure Mr. Bhanoji Rao did not fully realize the implications of the amendment when he tabled it. After having heard Mr. Conran Smith, it is obvious that it will be very undignified for a chairman to be considered to be the head of the menial staff in a municipality. I do not think it is the intention of the House to create any confusion in this respect. The Minister exercises certain control now; if we say that the Secretary and the Under Secretary should have some share in this control, the position will become more difficult. Similarly, in this case we should not introduce complications."

* Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—" Mr. President, I do not know if there is any necessity for the amendment. In section 75 of the Act it is already provided that—

> 'the chairman may fine, reduce, suspend, remove or dismiss any municipal officer or servant, etc.'

and with regard to this section, in the schedule, the word 'chairman' has been substituted by the words 'executive officer.' Therefore, the establishment *suo motu* becomes subordinate to the commissioner. Why then is there any necessity for restating the position that the establishment should be subordinate to the commissioner? It looks as though the position of the chairman will become undignified if this amendment is accepted. I think that clause (2) itself may be deleted."

* Mr. A. V. BHANOJI RAO:—" Sir, I gave notice of this amendment with the idea of removing the ambiguity. As Mr. Conran Smith pointed out, it is not my idea to vest any dual control over the establishment in the chairman and in the executive officer. No doubt as regards punishments, etc., we have given power to the commissioner; but yet the chairman is head of the municipality and the establishment has to be subordinate to him. That is why I moved this amendment, and I do not see how there can be a clash of powers as between the chairman and the executive officer. But if there is any objection to the amendment, I do not want to press it."

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause 9 was put and carried.

Clause 10.

* Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—" Sir, I move:

> 'For *the proviso proposed to be added to sub-section* (1) *of section* 68 *of the said Act*, substitute *the following proviso, namely*:
>
> " *Provided that in the case of municipalities included in Schedule IX or notified under sub-section* (1) *of section* 12-C

24th January 1933] [Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar]

the power of making on behalf of the Council all contracts whereof the value or amount does not exceed one thousand rupees shall be exercised by a committee consisting of the chairman, the commissioner and one member of the Council elected by it; and the Council shall not exercise or delegate the power of making such contracts." '

" The chairman of the Council is after all there by virtue of his being able to command a majority vote and he knows something of the affairs of the municipality; so his presence may be useful on the committee. Similarly, a representative of the Council may be there. I think the publicity involved in the disposal of the tenders by a committee of three consisting of the chairman, the commissioner and the representative of the Council will be very useful."

Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar:—" I second the amendment."

* Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed:—" I think, Sir, the scope of this amendment has not been well explained by the learned Member from Bellary. The amendment says that restrictions should be imposed in the case of contracts the amount of which does not exceed Rs. 1,000. I think the procedure laid down by this amendment will introduce delay and complications in certain cases. Considering the amount of the contract involved, viz., Rs. 1,000, I think the more efficacious method of disposing of tenders will be to delegate the power to the commissioner himself and then ask him to make a report to any committee or the Council that he has accepted such and such a tender. That will lead to the speedy disposal of tenders. After all, tenders for Rs. 1,000 and less will be for small works connected with the municipality and the nature of the works will be such that they would require immediate attention and immediate disposal. If the tenders are to be received from the contractors and then sifted by the commissioner, then placed before a committee, and the committee has to meet and accept or reject them—surely all this will be a long and circumlocutory procedure and the labour involved will be beyond all proportion to the amount of contract involved, viz., Rs. 1,000. I therefore think that this amendment is not so desirable as the one recommended by the Select Committee. We can wait and see the effect of the amendment proposed by the Select Committee and then consider after some time whether this amendment is necessary. For one thing there will be enormous delay by adopting the method suggested in this amendment and there will be a tendency to delay matters even in the committee itself. We have had experience elsewhere as to how tenders are delayed, how they are rejected and how tenders are called for again, as they happen to be defective, how the commissioner's recommendation itself happens to be defective and not borne out by facts. All these things, I say with great respect to the mover of the amendment, conduce to the inefficient working of the municipality. I would therefore urge that this amendment be withdrawn and that the original clause as passed by the Select Committee be accepted."

* Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti:—" Sir, if there is any circumlocutory procedure involved in this amendment, I may assure my

hon. Friend from the Central Districts Muhammadan Constituency that that circumlocution is not the making of the Mover of this amendment but that it is already there in the original clause itself. The effect of the present amendment is that the word ' chairman ' is substituted by the words ' chairman, commissioner and a member of the Council.' The idea of making this amendment is to give publicity to the rates that are quoted by tenderers. In the matter of purchases for immediate use, the power that is already bestowed by the Act either on the chairman or the commissioner still exists but so far as purchases by means of contract or by calling for tenders are concerned, it is desirable that along with the commissioner there must be somebody to represent the non-official side of the municipality. As regards the amount of Rs. 1,000, I know my hon. Friend, sitting as he does in the Corporation of Madras where contracts go generally to five digits and six digits, thinks that Rs. 1,000 is a small thing; but having regard to the resources of municipalities with which we are now dealing, tenders for Rs. 1,000 there, are as important as tenders for Rs. 50,000 in the Madras Corporation. So long as my Friend Mr. Basheer Ahmed is a member of the Works Standing Committee in the Madras Corporation and wants to scrutinize tenders for small amounts, it does not look graceful that he should deny the same right to the councillors of a mufassal municipality. Now that the explanation has been given as to the scope of this amendment, I hope my hon. Friend Mr. Basheer Ahmed with whom we have always got so many points of agreement will see that in this matter also there is no difference between us."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I shall put the amendment to the vote of the House. The question is :

' *In section* 68 *of the said Act, for the proviso* substitute *the following proviso, namely* :

" *Provided that in the case of municipalities included in Schedule IX or notified under sub-section* (1) *of section* 12-*C the power of making on behalf of the Council all contracts whereof the value or amount does not exceed one thousand rupees shall be exercised by a committee consisting of the chairman, the commissioner and one member of the Council elected by it; and the Council shall not exercise or delegate the power of making such contracts.*" ' "

The amendment was carried.

Clause 10, as amended, was then put and carried.

Clause 11.

* Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" Sir, I move—

' *that wherever the words* " *notified under sub-section* (2) *of section* 12-*C* " *occur, the words* " *notified under sub-section* (1) *of section* 12-*C* " *be substituted* '."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI :—" I second it."

The amendment was put and carried.

Clause 11, as amended, was put and carried.

24th January 1933]

Clause 12.

* Mr. E. Conran Smith :—" Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move: 12-30 p.m.

'*that in line* 1 *of new section* 73, for *the word* " *section* " substitute *the word* " *sections* ".' "

Dr. P. Subbarayan :—" I second it."

Mr. C. Basu Dev :—" Sir, may I speak on the clause? "

Mr. V. T. Arasu :—" Order, order, may I know, Sir, whether any non-official member is at liberty to speak from the Treasury Bench." (Laughter.)

* The hon. the President :—" I don't think there is any particular standing order or rule forbidding it. He may sit on the Treasury Bench whenever it is vacant and speak from there." (Laughter.)

Mr. V. T. Arasu :—" Whenever it is vacant." (Laughter.)

Dr. P. Subbarayan :—" With due respect to the Chair, Sir, may I submit that in the Houses of Parliament no private member is allowed to speak from the Treasury Bench." (Laughter.)

* The hon. the President :—" The hon. Member may go to his seat and speak from there. (Laughter.)"

Mr. C. Basu Dev :—" Sir, the section says :

'Save as provided' "

The hon. the President :—" Is the hon. Member proposing any amendment to the amendment already moved? "

Mr. C. Basu Dev :—" No, Sir."

* The hon. the President :—" I will put the amendment to the vote of the House and then he may move his amendment. The question is:

'*that in line* 1 *of new section* 73, for *the word* " *section* ", substitute *the word* " *sections* ".' "

The amendment was carried.

Mr. C. Basu Dev :—" Sir, I beg to move an amendment to the new section 73 to the following effect . . ."

* The hon. the President :—" I have already intimated to the House that I do not propose to admit any substantial amendments at this stage. So the hon. Member cannot move any amendment."

Clause 12, as amended, was put and carried.

Clause 13.

* Mr. A. V. Bhanoji Rao :—" Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move:

'*That in sub-section* (2) *of section* 305 *as amended*, insert *the following words between the words* " *notification* " *and* " *include* "—" *under sub-section* (2) *of section* 12 (*c*)".'

Every notification should state under which section it is done so this amendment removes that gap."

The amendment was duly seconded.

Clause 13, as amended, and Clause 14 were put and carried.

Clause 15.

* Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar :—" Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move:

'*That in clause* 15 *for the list of municipalities,* substitute *the following* :—

(1) *Bezwada.*
(2) *Coimbatore.*
(3) *Kumbakonam.*
(4) *Madura.*
(5) *Ootacamund.*
(6) *Rajahmundry.*
(7) *Salem.*
(8) *Tanjore.*
(9) *Trichinopoly.*
(10) *Tuticorin.*'

" As you are aware, Sir, there are two sections of opinion in this House who hold very strong views in regard to this matter. There is one section which says that this power of appointing commissioners should not be restricted to only the 26 municipalities, but should be extended to as large a number of municipalities as possible; and among the people who hold such view is my friend, Mr. Basu Dev. There are others who think that perhaps this number is too large. Sir, I think, taking all these into consideration, we have agreed to proceed cautiously but at the same time, we think also that we should take a substantial step forward. We shall begin with municipalities whose ordinary income is three lakhs. That at least will do away with the objection that the resources may not be sufficient to bear this expenditure. But I venture to think that even if you descend to municipalities with an income of two lakhs it would not be an unprofitable transaction; for I am quite sure that without adding any extra taxation of any sort, the commissioner will be able to find the extra money very easily, and even double the sum required, merely by enforcing existing provisions.

" Sir, in this we have taken into account the feeling of some of the members of this House, and have gone more than half-way to meet them. So the number has been put at ten. There are certain other municipalities which shall have to be brought within the ambit of this clause. Such municipalities, the Government may either notify and bring them into section 9, or if they find the causes for a commissioner's appointment are only temporary, they may appoint such an officer for a period of two or three years. I hope this arrangement will satisfy the view of the majority of the house. I therefore beg to suggest the substitution of the revised list for the list already in the draft."

Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu :—" I second it."

* Mr. C. Basu Dev :—" Mr. President, Sir, with regard to the amendment moved by Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar I wish to say a few words. The hon. Mover said that I am one of those who wish to have commissioners in as few municipalities as possible. (Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar : ' You have misunderstood me; I said you are for the commissioners to be appointed in as large a number of municipalities as possible.') (Laughter.)

24th January 1933] [Mr. C. Basu Dev]

" Very well, now that the Government have accepted his amendment that these executive officers should be drawn also from efficient municipal officials, I have no objection to the list of the municipalities as given in the schedule; and personally I am for adding some more to the list, if possible. But in view of the reason advanced by Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar I think this list is sufficient for the present."

Mr. G. SIMHACHALAM PANTULU :—" Sir, I beg to move that Guntur be added to the list."

Mr. G. R. PREMAYYA :—" I second it."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I think I have more than once repeated that I do not propose to allow substantial amendments at this stage. We have only to confine ourselves to the amendments that have been given notice of or to amendments that may be moved to them."

* Mr. J. A. DAVIS :—" Sir, I beg to move—

' to delete word " Ootacamund " from the schedule of municipalities for which commissioners shall be appointed.'

" Sir, I do so because we have in Ootacamund prominent men who take a great interest in it, who permanently reside there and have a stake in the station and residents will be more capable than the executive officers who will have only a passing interest. This hill station provides the seat of Government and was specially treated as a hill municipality along with Coonoor and Kodaikanal. For these, amongst other reasons, I move that Ootacamund may be excluded from the list."

* Rao Sahib V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI :—" Sir, I rise to second the amendment proposed by Mr. Davis. Of course, he has given various reasons why Ootacamund should be excluded. The object of this Bill is to purify municipal administration. Taking the case of the Ootacamund municipality, I am sure, my hon. Friend, Mr. Conran Smith will bear me out when I say, that Ootacamund has had a good municipal administration. Mr. Davis, who has been the chairman of that municipality for many years has proved to be one of the capable chairmen, and after him there is another chairman, who happens to be honorary. And even now 12-45 I do not think the administration has in any way gone wrong. That this p.m. Bill should be made to apply to a municipality whose administration is so satisfactory, I do not think, will stand to reason. So I would request that Ootacamund may be excluded from this list."

* Mr. MAHBOOB ALI BAIG :—" Mr. President, Sir, I move—

' that the following shall be substituted for the list of municipalities given in the schedule:

" Commissioners may be appointed for the municipalities which have a population of one lakh and more and with an income of five lakhs of rupees and more from ordinary receipts excluding contributions and drainage receipts ".'

" In moving this amendment, Sir, I should like to recall to the mind of the Mover of this Bill that when he brought forward his original Bill

[Mr. Mahboob Ali Baig] [24th January 1933

he was of opinion, and I suppose rightly too, that municipalities having a population of one lakh and more and an income of five lakhs of rupees and more should have executive officers. In the nature of things the activities of those municipalities will be very numerous and therefore an honorary chairman may not be able to discharge his duties well. I suppose that was the reason, and a very sound reason too, which impelled him to move that sort of Bill. Or the reason may be, as he puts it in his statement of objects and reasons attached to his original Bill, that big municipalities have not been able to discharge their duties well on account of these various activities and in some cases also on account of inability on the part of the chairmen. Or, Sir, according to him, the criterion is whether a municipality is such that the chairman is not able to do justice to the various duties that fall upon him or whether the municipal chairman has been administering the municipal affairs unsatisfactorily. These being the criteria for moving a Bill of this kind, I do not see any reason now why the scope of the Bill should be extended. And when the scope of the Bill is to be extended, what is the criterion to be adopted? It has been said by certain persons that either all municipalities must be given executive officers or none at all. The discretion must be left to the Government to find out whether any municipality is working well or not, whether any municipal chairman has been able to discharge his duties well or not and whether it is possible for an honorary chairman to discharge the duties satisfactorily. Therefore my submission to this House is this, that in the case of municipalities which are getting less than five lakhs it is not possible to spend Rs. 10,000 a year; and when such municipalities are working well, why should they be disturbed? I am not going into the question as to the retrograde step that we are taking in appointing executive officers in municipalities which should develop self-governing ideas among the people themselves. But, even as it is, the list that is cut down from 26 is arbitrary. If that is going to be so, why not my hon. Friend the Mover of this Bill stick on to his original proposition that municipalities having an income of five lakhs and more and a population of one lakh and more should have these undesirable executive officers? In this view I am sure many of my friends on this side and on that side also will agree. If you want to make a distinction between one municipality and another, what is the criterion to be adopted? Why should municipalities which are getting an income of two lakhs and three lakhs be excluded from the operation of this Bill? If you want to exclude these municipalities and appoint executive officers where the chairmen are inefficient and are not able to cope with the work, let the Government go into the question and decide which municipalities most require these executive officers. Why should we be afraid of the Government taking this power? Although I am very reluctant to give power to the Government, in the circumstances narrated by my friend Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar that in some cases abuse of power has been taking place and honorary chairmen are not able to discharge their duties properly, the Government may be allowed to go into

24th January 1933] [Mr. Mahboob Ali Baig]

the question and see whether any municipality deserves an executive officer or not. I do not say there are not some municipalities which are abusing their powers. It may be. But which is the authority that is going to decide it? Why should we arbitrarily lay down that these municipalities because they happen to get five lakhs of income must get executive officers? It may be that municipalities that are getting more than five lakhs of rupees are discharging their duties well, and it may be that some municipalities which have an income of below five lakhs are not administering their affairs well. That being the case, why should we single out these municipalities given in the list for appointment of executive officers? If you allow this list to be passed, the implication will be that some municipalities which are getting over five lakhs a year and more are inefficiently administering their affairs. It is a stigma cast on them. Why should we cast such a stigma on these municipalities. We are very uncharitable in singling out these municipalities and forcing executive officers on them. Let the Government go into the whole question whether a municipality is managing its affairs well or not. Then if the Government think they should appoint an executive officer for such a municipality, let them do so. Why should municipalities, simply because they are getting five lakhs, be submitted to this undesirable treatment of having executive officers. Therefore, my submission is that on principle the exclusion of certain municipalities and the retention of some other municipalities in the scope of this Bill is highly objectionable.

" And then, from the point of view of good administration, I do not see any reason why others should be excluded and these should be included. What is the criterion? Are we going to conduct our affairs in this fashion? Because certain persons want these municipalities should be included, they are included; and because certain other persons want certain municipalities to be excluded from the operation of this Bill, they are excluded. The criterion of an income of two lakhs or three lakhs is not mentioned in the Act. That is the understanding they say. But is there any sense behind that understanding? Is there any principle underlying it? And are we going to accept the arguments of persons who have not got any principle behind the inclusion or exclusion of these municipalities? I can very well understand if the list as it emerged from the select committee is accepted; that represents the considered opinion of the select committee. I can very well understand the Mover of the Bill either sticking to his original proposition that municipalities getting an income of five lakhs and over and having a population of one lakh and over should have executive officers, or his accepting the deliberate conclusions of the select committee. Why is it that he is yielding to the advice of some members now? Is he not so strong as to stick to any one of these two principles? I am not casting any reflections on him, but I am sorry to say that he has yielded in a way which does not behove him as a leader in this House. Therefore I say it is not doing justice to himself or to the municipalities themselves if he agrees to the new list. The select committee have come

[Mr. Mahboob Ali Baig] [24th January 1933

to a conclusion after deep deliberation. Let their decision stand. If not let power be given to Government to appoint executive officers only in such municipalities in which there is inefficiency of administration or heaviness of work. So I do not see any reason for the substitution of new municipalities for those that are recommended by the select committee. It looks like child's play. Are we serious men doing serious business? So let my friend Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar stick to his original proposition or modify his view with reference to the advice given to him in the select committee. I request hon. Members either to drop the whole list recommended by the select committee or accept it in full. It should not be said by outsiders that we are playing like children. I would request my hon. Friend Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar and those who support this substitution of the new list to think over the matter, and in fairness to themselves and all who participated in this discussion and also in fairness to the municipalities that are going to be affected by this Bill, to act on either principle, so that it may not be said that he (Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar) yielded to this man or that man, or that the Government yielded to this man or that man. He must stick to his own view and not follow this man or that man. I never expected an erstwhile leader in this House will allow himself to be influenced by certain persons. Therefore I would appeal to him and the Members of this House concerned to think over the matter and either drop the whole thing and give the whole power to the Government or accept my amendment which from very many points of view will satisfy everybody."

Mr. J. A. Davis :—" I second it."

* Mr. G. Simhachalam Pantulu :—" Mr. President, Sir, I am unfortunately not very enthusiastic about this subject because I do not happen to be a chairman of any municipality, but I rise to say only this. My view is that mal-administration alone should be the criterion for appointing an executive officer. In that view Guntur is a typical instance and so I want that Guntur should be added to the list of municipalities which according to the terms or arrangements or whatever they may be called, are going to have executive officers. The case of Guntur came up recently before the Government for mal-administration because the business there came to a standstill. The chairman was also by notification removed from office. Therefore I request that typical cases of mal-administration may be considered. I move that Guntur may be included in the list of municipalities mentioned in Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar's amendment."

Mr. P. V. Krishnayya Choudari :—" I second it."

* The hon. the President :—" At this stage, I would like to place all the amendments before the House, so that there may be a general discussion on them. The first is Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar's amendment for the substitution of a list of ten municipalities in clause 15, namely, Bezwada, Coimbatore, Kumbakonam, Madura, Ootacamund, Rajahmundry, Salem, Tanjore, Trichinopoly and Tuticorin. Then there is Mr. Davis's amendment to delete Ootacamund from this list. Thirdly,

24th January 1933] [The President]

Mr. Mahboob Ali Baig's amendment that the following should be substituted for the list: municipalities which have a population of one lakh and more and an income of five lakhs and more from ordinary receipts excluding contributions and drainage receipts. Then there is Mr. Simhachalam's amendment that Guntur should be added to the list furnished by Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar."

All the amendments are now for the discussion of the House.

* Mr. M. A. MANIKKAVELU NAYAKAR :—" I am afraid that the discussion is proceeding on a misunderstanding. The hon. Member for Bellary when he moved his amendment clearly pointed out that the list that he submitted was not done arbitrarily but was based on some principle. Hon. Members were mentioning that the list was drawn to suit the fancies of particular individuals. But it is not so, Sir. The hon. Member for Bellary said that he fixed the receipt at 3 lakhs. In the original Bill the income was fixed at 5 lakhs. The Select Committee reduced it 2 lakhs. As a result of the conference of leaders of certain sections of the House they came to the present conclusion which is reasonable. That being so, I cannot see how there can be any complaint from individual members that a particular municipality was included or excluded arbitrarily. The only amendment that has been given on certain principle is that of the hon. Member for Bezwada, Mr. Mahboob Ali. All other amendments point that particular municipalities must either be included or excluded. There is no arbitrariness in fixing the list. Since the whole thing is based on a principle I should like the House to take into consideration the conclusion come to by the leaders of the various sections which should be given due respect. On the other hand if there is any suitable amendment before the House based on any particular principle which is acceptable to the majority of members then it could be taken. But from the discussion no such majority opinion is expressed except for the amendment moved by the hon. Member from Bellary. That being so, I request the House that the amendment originally moved should be accepted." 1 p m

* Mr. M. DEVADASAN :—" Mr. President, in opposing all the amendments, I want to make a few observations. I am one of those who wish to have executive officers for all those municipalities. Unfortunately Mr. Basu Dev had to withdraw his amendment. He wanted that Government should appoint executive officers in all municipalities for which appointment of executive officers are found necessary. I had the misfortune of seconding his motion. Though he withdrew the motion yet I am of the same opinion. We are here for judging all people alike and we are not here to judge one from one standpoint of view and another from different point of view. There are 81 municipalities in our presidency. Of these we want to apply the present Bill only to 26 municipalities. The amendments seek to limit it to 12 or so. If that be the case what is the standard on which you can proceed? My friend, Mr. Basu Dev, says that it is on the basis of receipts of revenue that they are making appointments. It is not the revenue that should

[Mr. M. Devadasan] [24th January 1933

be the criterion; nor is it the population that should be the criterion for the appointment of executive officers.

"You have known since the recent election what a number of motions of no-confidence against the chairman and vice-chairman are cropping up. The result of no-confidence motions is deadlock of business. It is to counteract the evils of no-confidence among other things that this Bill is sought to be enacted. But I submit that if you want to be fair to all people and if you want to have sound administration in all municipalities then it is just and proper that all municipalities should have executive officers. It may be urged by several members that several municipalities have not enough funds to afford the appointment of the executive officers. But I submit that it is not necessary that you should appoint big salaried men for small municipalities. Tahsildars or deputy tahsildars may be enough in the case of the small municipalities and deputy collectors in the case of big municipalities. You all know that most of the chairmen of municipalities are honorary men and they are unable to cope with the work as some are vakils, or merchants or belong to other professions. They don't attend to municipal work in the way in which full-timed officers would attend.

"On principle also I must oppose the invidious distinction made between important municipalities and other municipalities. Individual municipalities on which we thrust the appointments may say that they do not want the appointments. The Bill does not provide for executive officers for minor municipalities if they desire the same.

"From my past experience as a member of a muncipal council, I have to say that the majority of the municipal chairmen as they are now, are not able to devote their full time and energy for the better administration of municipalities of which they are in charge. So in the interests of sound administration of municipalities I wish there should be officers for all municipalities big or small. With these few words I oppose the motions of Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar, Mr. Davis and others."

* Mr. E. Conran Smith :—" I rise to support the amendment moved by the Mover of the Bill and to ask this House in the interests of municipal administration to reject the other amendments. I think that the amendments moved by Mr. Muniswami Pillai and Mr. Davis are prompted by a misunderstanding of the intention of this Bill. I have tried once or twice in conversation with the Members of this House to show that this Bill was not intended as a penal measure and if those Gentlemen who moved the amendments will disabuse their minds of that idea and consider it in a more dispassionate way I feel they will not press their amendments. I think I am perhaps in a better position than most of us here to appreciate the difficulties of non-official chairmen. It is the wish of the Government that those difficulties should as far as possible be mitigated and I firmly believe that the principle of this Bill is the right one and that the step which we are now taking

24th January 1933] [Mr. E. Conran Smith]

is a right one and I would appeal to these gentlemen to withdraw their amendments. If I can answer for Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar, I will say this. The hon. Member for Bezwada wanted to know why Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar did not stick to his original list. The reason is this. Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar was keen on his Bill and it was necessary in the interests of the principle of the Bill to come to some agreement with the various parties of the House. The agreement now reached is a fair one. I would again ask the Members of the House to stand by it. Mr. Manikkavelu Nayakar has paid a tribute to the reasoning of Mr. Mahboob Ali which I think he does not deserve. I think Mr. Mahboob Ali Baig will admit he is suiting principles to a particular case and not enunciating principles on their merits. I would like to respond to the appeal of Mr. Muniswami Pillai because I know that the particular municipal administration to which he referred has been successful and I would like if I could, to support the wish which he expressed to exclude the Ootacamund municipality from the schedule. But because as I have said the provision is not a penal one I see no reason why it should be excluded. I would therefore ask Mr. Davis and Mr. Muniswami Pillai to take a broad view of this measure and not base their views on their championship of individual municipalities. With these few words I would support the motion of Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar."

* Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"I think, Sir, many of the objections urged by the previous speaker have been answered by the last speaker. The chairman of the Ootacamund municipality has himself asked for a Commissioner to assist him in his work. Well, Sir, I would ask my Friend Mr. Simhachalam not to press his amendment. We have something now to proceed upon. If he feels that Guntur affairs are such as to benefit by this appointment, there are ways and means by which he can see that the situation is improved. With regard to the passionate observations of my Friend from Bezwada that I was giving the go-by to any principles that I may have had in regard to this matter, it is true that I based the original list on a very high standard. But I found in the Select Committee that it would be well to bring in as many municipalities as possible under the operation of this Bill. But I see there are difficulties in the way. For example, there is the difficulty of finding proper officers. For then, we are to depend on people already in the service of local bodies or in the Government service. As was expressed by the Chief Minister, the Government are finding it difficult to spare at once a large number of people. We want as many municipalities as there are officers. It is not that these ten municipalities alone will get an executive officer and none else. We have made provision in the Bill and have given power to Government to add to the list. I think that my friend from Bezwada is not fair to himself or to other people who have taken part in framing this Bill, in imputing motives to them. I hope, Sir, that the list as suggested by me will meet with the approval of the House and that the other amendments will be withdrawn."

1-15 p.m. * Mr. G. SIMHACHALAM PANTULU :—" In view of the explanation so kindly offiered by the hon. Mover of this Bill, I beg to withdraw my amendment."

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. J. A. DAVIS :—" I also withdraw my amendment."

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I will now put Mr. Mahboob Ali Baig's amendment to the vote of the House. The question is—

'For the *existing schedule*, substitute *the following* :—

" *Commissioner may be appointed for the municipalities which have a population of one lakh and more and with an income of 5 lakhs and more from ordinary receipts excluding contributions and drainage receipts* ".' "

The amendment was declared lost.

Mr. Mahboob Ali Baig demanded a poll which was taken with the following result :—

Aye.

1 Mr. Mahboob Ali Baig.

Noes.

1 The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur.
2 ,, Diwan Bahadur Sir M Krishnan Nayar.
3 ,, Sir Archibald Campbell.
4 ,, Mr. H. G. Stokes.
5 ,, Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar.
6 ,, Mr. P. T. Rajan.
7 ,, the Raja of Bobbili.
8 Mrs. K. Alamelumangathayaramma.
9 Mr. C. E. Jones.
10 ,, J. A. Thorne.
11 ,, H. M. Hood.
12 ,, R. Madanagopal Nayudu.
13 ,, S. H. Slater.
14 ,, E. Conran Smith.
15 ,, T. Sundara Rao Nayudu.
16 Khan Sahib Syed Tajuddin Sahib Bahadur.
17 Mr. M. D. T Ranganatha Mudaliyar.
18 Rao Bahadur A. T. Pannirselvam.
19 Mr. G. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.
20 Rao Bahadur R. Srinivasan.
21 Mr. M. Devadasan.
22 Rao Sahib N. Siva Raj.
23 Subadar Major S. A. Nanjappa Bahadur.
24 Rao Sahib V. I. Muniswami Pillai.
25 Mr. B. P. Sesha Reddi.
26 ,, P. V. Rajagopala Pillai.
27 ,, V. G. Vasudeva Pillai.
28 ,, P. Bayappa Reddi.
29 Khan Bahadur T. M. Moidoo Sahib Bahadur.
30 Mr. P. K. Ramachandra Padayachi.
31 ,, G. Lakshmana Reddi.
32 Rao Sahib V. Dharmalingam Pillai.
33 Mr. M. A. Muthiah Chettiyar.
34 Diwan Bahadur A. M. M. Murugappa Chettiyar.
35 Mr. H. M. Jaggannatham.
36 Rao Sahib D. Krishnamurti.
37 The Zamindar of Kirlampudi.
38 Rao Sahib D. V. Narasimhaswami.
39 Pandit Ganala Ramamurti.
40 Dr. P. Subbarayan.
41 Mr. Yakub Hasan.
42 ,, K. R. Venkatarama Ayyar.
43 Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar.
44 Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar.
45 Khan Bahadur Mahmud Schamnad Sahib Bahadur.
46 Mr. T. S. Ramaswami Ayyar.
47 ,, V. T. Arasu.
48 Rao Bahadur P. C. Muthu Chettiyar.

24th January 1933]

Noes—cont.

49 B. Pocker Sahib Bahadur.
50 Mr. V. P. Narayanan Nambiyar.
51 ,, M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar.
52 ,, A. B. Shetty.
53 ,, G. Simhachalam Pantulu.
54 ,, Abdul Hameed Khan.
55 ,, Ahmed Miran Sahib.
56 ,, K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder.
57 ,, U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt.
58 ,, K. Singam Ayyangar.
59 Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu.
60 Mr. K. P. Raman Menon.
61 ,, M. S. Sreshta.
62 Mr. H. B. Ari Gowder.
63 ,, P. V. Krishnayya Choudari.
64 Rai Sahib C. Kolanda Reddi.
65 Mr. K. M. Duraiswami Reddiyar.
66 Rao Bahadur R. K. Venugopal Nayudu.
67 Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.
68 Rao Bahadur C. Natesa Mudaliyar.
69 Diwan Bahadur S. Ellappa Chettiyar.
70 Mr. C. Basu Dev.
71 ,, C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar.
72 ,, P. Madhusoodhanan Thangal.
73 ,, C. Krishnan.

Neutral.

1 The Zamindar of Bodinayakkanur.
2 Mr. A. V. Bhanoji Rao.
3 ,, J. A. Davis.
4 ,, G. R. Premayya.
5 Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo.
6 Diwan Bahadur M. Gopalaswami Mudaliyar.
7 Mr. C. Indriah.
8 ,, J. Kuppuswami Choudari.

Aye 1. *Noes*. 73. *Neutral* 8.

The amendment was lost.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I will now put Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar's amendment to the vote. The question is—

' *In clause* 15, for *the list of municipalities*, substitute *the following list, namely* :—

1 *Bezwada.*
2 *Coimbatore.*
3 *Kumbakonam.*
4 *Madura.*
5 *Ootacamund.*
6 *Rajahmundry.*
7 *Salem.*
8 *Tanjore.*
9 *Trichinopoly*
10 *Tuticorin* '."

The amendment was carried.

Clause 15, as amended, was put and carried.

New Clause 15.

* Mr. E. CONRAN SMITH :—" Sir, I move the amendment standing in my name, viz. :—

' Renumber *clauses* 15, 16 *and* 17 *as clauses* 16, 17 *and* 18 *respectively and* insert *the following as clause* 15, *namely* :—

" 15. *After section* 369 *of the said Act, the following section shall be inserted, namely* :—

' 370 (1) *Any reference to the chairman contained in any enactment in force in the Presidency of Madras or in any notification, order, scheme, rule, form or bylaw made under any such enactment and in force in the said Presidency shall, where such reference*

[Mr. E. Conran Smith] [24th January 1933

relates to the executive functions of the chairman, be construed as a reference to the executive authority.

(2) *If any question arises as to whether any such reference relates to the executive functions of the chairman or not, the decision of the Local Government shall be final '." '*

" As explained already, the necessity for this amendment arises from the fact that reference occurs in other Acts, such as the Town Planning Act, to the chairman of a municipal council, and the object of this amendment is to make it clear that the executive authority whether it be the chairman or the commissioner is referred to in those Acts also."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" I second it."

The amendment was put and carried.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Clauses 16 and 17, which are now amended to be 17 and 18, are for the vote of the House."

Clauses 16 and 17 renumbered as 17 and 18 were put and carried.

* Mr. E. CONRAN SMITH :—" I move, Sir, the further consequential amendment to the amendment already moved and passed—

' *Schedule A.*

' (*a*) *In the heading,* for *the words and figures* " [*see section* 16 (1),] " substitute *the words and figures* " [*see section* 17 (1)]."

' (*b*) *In the first paragraph, after the figures* " 50 (4)," insert *the figures* " 51 (1) ".'

" The first amendment requires no explanation, as it is merely consequential to the amendment just passed. The second is to supply an omission. In going through the sections of the Act, it is found that section 51 (1) has been omitted."

Mr. A. V. BHANOJI RAO :—" I second it."

The amendment was put and carried.

Mr. E. CONRAN SMITH :—" Sir, I move—

' *Schedule B.*

' (*a*) *In the heading,* for *the words and figures* " [*see section* 16 (2)]," substitute *the words and figures* " [*see section* 17 (2)]."

' (*b*) *In the second of the items relating to section* 327, *in column* 2, for *the figure* " (4)," substitute *the figure* " (1)."

' (*c*) *In the second of the items relating to section* 352 *in column* (4), omit *the word* " *or* " *occurring before the words* " *executive authority.*"

24th January 1933] [Mr. E. Conran Smith]

'(*d*) *In the item immediately before the item relating to section* 368, *sub-section* (1), *in column* (1), insert *the figures* "359".'

"This is merely a drafting amendment, and I do not think it requires any explanation."

Mr. V. P. NARAYANAN NAMBIYAR:—"I second it."

The amendment was put and carried.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Schedules A and B, as amended, are for the vote of the House."

Schedules A and B, as amended, were put and carried.

* Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"Mr. President, I move that—

'*the Preamble do form part of the Bill*'."

Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"I second it."

* Mr. E. CONRAN SMITH:—"I move that—

'*in line* 3, *for the word* "*purpose*" *the word* "*purposes*" *be substituted*'."

Mr. T. SUNDARA RAO NAYUDU:—"I second it."

The Preamble, as amended, was then put and carried.

After Lunch (2-30 p.m.).

* Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"Mr. President, I move—

'*that the Bill to amend the Madras District Municipalities Act,* 1920, *be passed into law.*'

"In doing so I shall allow myself to make only one remark. The credit for what we have been able to achieve so far is due to all friends in this House who have wholeheartedly given their support to it. I should like to say, I am especially indebted to the hon. the Chief Minister, Dr. Subbarayan and Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu and, if I may add an undiluted bureaucrat, I would also mention Mr. Conran Smith. (Laughter.) I have very great pleasure in moving that this Bill be passed into law."

Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"I second the motion and in doing so, I heartily associate myself with the remarks made by the Mover in regard to the help which we got for piloting this Bill. Sir, what appeared at one time to be a Bill which will receive the approbation and support of all sections of the House, unfortunately just at the last moment was viewed by some as aiming at something more than a help to the administration. I am glad, however, that at last good sense prevailed and it has been passed by the House. I am sure Government will find for these posts suitable men with administrative experience and give for working the system we are trying to introduce their best brains. I have no doubt that the experience of the few municipalities for which we are now appointing administrative officers will make it

possible for the Government to extend it to other municipalities also, at any rate, to municipalities where factious spirit prevails and in consequence the administration suffers."

* Mr. K. R. VENKATARAMA AYYAR :—" I am very glad to associate myself with the previous speakers in the general satisfaction that will be felt all over the Presidency by reason of this measure becoming law with the consent of all sides of the House. No doubt it would have given us greater satisfaction if there was no interference at all with schedule 9 as it emerged from the Select Committee. We trust that the power given to Government to notify other municipalities and bring them into the schedule from time to time will be very wisely used in all necessary instances and that without undue delay. To this end it is hoped that the Government would be recruiting officers in the various services in such numbers as might enable them always to keep and find a sufficient number of reserves from whom to draw commissioners for the bigger municipalities. Because, although we are aware that, under the law as it is passed to-day, it will be open to make selection of commissioners from municipal and local fund services as well as from the cadre of Government servants, in the case of the bigger municipalities it will perhaps be found necessary, more and more, to depend upon tried and competent men from the regular Government services.

" So far as Madura is concerned, it is so vast a city that, if it had been possible, we should have preferred to have it made into a corporation on the model of the City Corporation. But, as any attempt to pass separate legislation in regard to Madura alone might have involved a delay, those interested in Madura have agreed to share in the benefits under this Bill side by side with other major municipalities. No doubt, under the law as it is passing to-day, the maximum amount of salary and allowances payable to a commissioner is only Rs. 800. Doubts occurred to me, both during the Select Committee stage and subsequently—I wish to put them to responsible Members of Government and Secretaries and also other Members of this House—whether, after all, the requirements of the Madura municipality would, at all junctures and at critical junctures particularly, be met by the appointment of an officer for whom you will be in a position to pay only Rs. 800. I think situations have arisen in the past in the case of Madura and may arise again in the future,—at any rate the present is such a situation—when, to evolve order out of chaos, it would be necessary to commit the executive administration of that place in the hands of a first-class Civilian officer who would be able to go ahead with an amount of driving force, with independence and with impartiality which are absolutely essential so far as that municipality is concerned. Possibly about Rs. 15,000 a year, if not Rs. 18,000 might be required to secure such an officer for Madura. But the maximum payable from out of municipal funds is only Rs. 800 per mensem. I hope Government will come to our help so far as Madura is concerned and find the necessary money to pay such an officer if they agree in the view that, at the present juncture, Madura should be served well by an officer of the type I am suggesting.

24th January 1933] [Mr. K. R. Venkatarama Ayyar]

" I hope, Sir, that without taking more time at this stage, it would be fitting that I associate myself once more with the previous speakers in the feeling of thankfulness which we feel towards the Chief Minister and Mr. Conran Smith both of whom have done a very great deal to bring agreement where disagreement loomed large, and to see that the labours bestowed over this very necessary and beneficial Bill were not wasted. I think, Sir, this is an achievement of which this House could be proud. It is an achievement which, in the actual execution and administration of the Act, will create opportunities to the Government to get more and more credit for themselves by bringing under the operation of this Act more and more municipalities to which it would be a benefit to extend the advantage of appointing commissioners. With these words, Sir, I have very great pleasure in supporting this motion of the hon. Mover of the Bill."

* Rao Sahib V. I. Muniswami Pillai :—" Mr. President, I rise to support the motion before the House. Sir, in the initial stages there was a fear that this Bill would lower the status of the municipal councillors. But that fear was dispelled by the eloquent advocacy of the measure, both in the Select Committee and in this House, by the ex-Ministers Dr. Subbarayan and Diwan Bahadur Muniswami Nayudu and by the able Local Self-Government Secretary Mr. Conran Smith. We hope that the Bill in its present form will give more facilities for the successful working of the municipalities.

" There is a fear among the municipal employees, that in the selection of officers for commissionerships the claims of the seniors among them would be overlooked. I am sure the Government in selecting commissioners will give due weight to the experience and long service of employees in the municipalities who have been able to give a good account of their administrative knowledge. As there is a move on the part of Government to provincialize the cadres of health officers and engineers of municipalities, I think time will show how far this measure is useful in the administration of municipalities. As this Bill had the support of two gentlemen who had opportunity to deal with the portfolio of Local Self-Government, I am sure this must go a long way to improve municipal administration."

* Mr. C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar :—" Sir, yesterday I thought that the Bill was going to die on account of certain amendments moved by a section of the House, but after discussing the matter with the Members concerned, I felt satisfied that there was no such risk. When the parties put their heads together, they came to the conclusion that the measure was a beneficial one.

" One thing that struck me most forcibly is that all of us while keeping up the ideal that we have to reach before us must always bear in mind the fact that all self-governing institutions should be safely administered and they must be in the hands of well trained and good executive officers, otherwise the institutions may break. It would really be very good if we are able to have officers like Mr. Conran Smith as 2-45 p.m.

Commissioners for our municipalities, who will be able to give us their practical wisdom in administering the affairs of our municipalities.

"Some people are afraid that this law is an infringement on popular liberty. I do not think so. On the other hand we will be able to have by the introduction of this measure executive officers who will be able to bring to bear on our municipal administration all their administrative experience which coupled with the idealism which our chairmen or municipal councillors may have will bring in very beneficial results to the various municipalities. The Bill may be regarded by some as being very reactionary in that it will give power to the Government to bring under the operation of this Act any municipality which they like. It is only in cases where the municipalities go wrong and are not able to grapple with administrative problems which may arise before them from time to time that this measure will be applied. In any event I must say that the passing of this measure is a very happy augury for the future because all parties put their heads together and sunk their differences and the result is we have been able to put this Bill on the Statute Book. In these circumstances I thank the hon. the Mover of the Bill, and all those persons who endeavoured their utmost to clear the sky when it became clouded and thus enabled this Council to pass the Bill into law."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"Vote, vote, Sir."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The question is—

'*that the Bill be passed into law*'."

The motion was carried and the Bill was passed into law.

V.—RESOLUTIONS ON MATTERS OF GENERAL PUBLIC INTEREST.

(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF A BROADCASTING SERVICE FOR THE MADRAS PRESIDENCY.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Yesterday resolution No. I was moved and seconded. That resolution reads as follows:—

'*This Council recommends to the Government to take early steps to establish a broadcasting service for this Presidency*'."

The resolution is for the discussion of the House.

* Mr. T. S. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—"Under Standing Order 33, I desire to move—

'*that all the other business on the agenda do stand over and that resolution No. I in to-day's list of business be taken up first*'."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTI:—"I second it."

The motion was put and carried and the other items of business were allowed to stand over. Mr. Ramaswami Ayyar's resolution was taken up.

24th January 1933]

(2) REMISSION OF $12\frac{1}{2}$ PER CENT IN THE EXISTING RATE OF ASSESSMENT ON RYOTWARI LANDS IN THE PRESIDENCY

* Mr. T. S. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—" Mr. President, I beg to move the following resolution :—

' *This Council recommends to the Government that a remission of at least $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent in the existing rate of assessment on ryotwari lands in the Presidency be granted during current fasli.*'

" Sir, I propose to be very brief, for I take it that there may not be much time for the resolution to be discussed in detail. Before I state my case in support of the resolution, let me explain its scope. I have asked for remission of at least $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. I know that in some districts the owners of ryotwari lands are claiming 25 per cent. Recently a deputation of Tanjore mirasdars waited on His Excellency the Governor and pleaded for a remission of 25 per cent. I also understand that one hon. Member representing the Tanjore district in this House has also given notice of an amendment to my resolution stating that a remission of 25 per cent should be made. But the main reason which induced me to fix the figure at $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent is my anxiety that practical effect should be given to this resolution. It is not my intention merely to raise the question and leave it to the Government to decide it as they like. I want to co-operate with the Government in this matter. It is not merely as a Member of the Opposition that I have given notice of this resolution. I know, Sir, that it will be possible for the Government to give effect to this resolution. Due to the great efforts made by the Government and especially the hon. the Finance Member, the Government have been able to reduce the expenditure both recurring and non-recurring in the budget of this Presidency. I know with what great trouble and anxiety the hon. the Finance Member worked to get the budget of this Presidency balanced. When most other Provinces have deficit budgets, our Province stands to-day in the fortunate position of having a balanced budget. Our thanks are due to the hon. the Finance Member for having steered the Province during troublous times to the haven of safety. But at the same time as the Mover of this resolution, which indicates that the agriculturists should have some benefit, I am anxious that Government should give consideration to the plight in which the agriculturists of our Province are placed because of the heavy fall in prices of foodstuffs.

" The other portion of the resolution to which I would like to refer is the wording ' in the Presidency.' Though it may be that in the case of Tanjore and a few other recently settled districts there is a stronger case for remission, I feel that there is a case really for the whole Presidency. My resolution is based mainly on the fact that prices of foodstuffs, especially paddy, have fallen very low and the agriculturist is not able to get that margin of profit which he is entitled to get from the land.

" There is also another portion of the resolution to which I shall refer, viz., the words ' current fasli.' I gave notice of this resolution because, as I said before, I wanted that it should be given practical effect. I am anxious, Sir, that even in the current fasli relief should be given

Noes.

1 The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur.
2 ,, Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar.
3 ,, Sir Archibald Campbell.
4 ,, Mr. H. G. Stokes.
5 ,, Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar.
6 ,, Mr. P. T. Rajan.
7 ,, the Raja of Bobbili.
8 Mr. B. P. Sesha Reddi.
9 Mrs. K. Alamelumangathayaramma.
10 Mr. C. E. Jones.
11 ,, J. A. Thorne.
12 ,, H. M. Hood.
13 ,, R. Madanagopal Nayudu.
14 ,, S. H. Slater.
15 ,, E. Conran Smith.
16 ,, T. Sundara Rao Nayudu.
17 Khan Sahib Syed Tajuddin Sahib Bahadur.
18 Mr. M. D. T. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.
19 ,, V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar.
20 Rao Bahadur A. T. Pannirselvam.
21 ,, R. Srinivasan.
22 Mr. M. Devadasan.
23 Rao Sahib N. Siva Raj.
24 Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappa Bahadur.
25 Rao Sahib V. I. Muniswami Pillai.
26 Mr W. O. Wright.
27 ,, P. V. Rajagopala Pillai.
28 ,, V. G. Vasudeva Pillai.
29 Mr. P. Bayappa Reddi.
30 Khan Bahadur T. M. Moidoo Sahib Bahadur.
31 Mr. P. K. Ramachandra Padayachi.
32 ,, G. Lakshmana Reddi.
33 Rao Sahib V. Dharmalingam Pillai.
34 The Maharaja of Venkatagiri.
35 The Kumara Raja of Venkatagiri.
36 The Zamindar of Mirzapuram.
37 ,, Bodinayakkanur.
38 Mr. M. A. Muthiah Chettiyar.
39 ,, A. V. Bhanoji Rao.
40 Diwan Bahadur A. M. M. Murugappa Chettiyar.
41 Mr. J. A. Davis.
42 ,, H. M. Jagannatham.
43 Rao Sahib D. Krishnamurti.
44 ,, P. Subramanyam Chetti.
45 The Zamindar of Kirlampudi.
46 Rao Sahib C. Jayaram Nayudu.
47 ,, D. V. Narasimhaswami.
48 Pandit Ganala Ramamurti.
49 Mr. A. Harischandrudu Nayudu.
50 ,, K. Kesavaramamurti Nayudu.
51 S. M. K. Beyabani Sahib Bahadur.
52 Rao Bahadur C. Natesa Mudaliyar.
53 Diwan Bahadur S. Ellappa Chettiyar.
54 Mr. C. Basu Dev.
55 ,, F. G. Luker.
56 ,, R. Foulkes.
57 ,, F. J. Stanes.
58 ,, W. K. M. Langley.
59 ,, R. M. Palat.

Neutral.

1. Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.
2. Mr. C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar.

Ayes 31. *Noes* 59. *Neutral* 2.

The motion was lost.

The House then adjourned to meet again at 11 a.m. the next day.

VI.—PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE.

1. [a] *Annual returns of officers under the Government of Madras in the Gazetted and non-Gazetted services who held permanent and acting or temporary appointments on the* 1st *April* 1932.

2. [b] *Note with statements regarding revision of scales of pay for services.*

R. V. KRISHNA AYYAR,
Secretary to the Legislative Council.

[a] Printed separately.
[b] Printed as Appendix IV on pages 256–296 infra.

Appendix I.

[Vide answer to question No. 469 asked by Mr. M. D. T. Ranganatha Mudaliyar at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 24th January 1933, page 168 supra.]

(i)

G.O. Ms. No. 781, L. & M., dated 29th February 1932.

Read—the following papers:—

Memorandum No. 42681-1 C, L. & M., dated 23rd October 1931.

Memorandum No. 42681-2 C, L. & M., dated 23rd October 1931.

Order—Ms. No. 781, *L. & M., dated* 29*th February* 1932.

All presidents of district boards and chairmen of municipal councils are informed that Government consider that licence fees should not be levied on motor lorries not plying for hire, i.e., private lorries. The Government will however have no objection to a nominal fee of Rs. 5 per annum being levied by local bodies in respect of such lorries. All presidents of district boards and chairmen of municipal councils are accordingly requested to see that the maximum rate of licence fees levied on these vehicles does not exceed Rs. 5 per annum per lorry.

(By order of the Government, Ministry of Local Self-Government)

E. Conran Smith,
Secretary to Government.

To all Presidents of District Boards.
,, all Chairmen of Municipal Councils.
,, the Inspector of Municipal Councils and Local Boards.
,, the Examiner of Local Fund Accounts.

(ii)

G.O. Ms. No. 1263, L. & M., dated 6th April 1932.

Read—the following paper:—

G.O. No. 781, L. & M., dated 29th February 1932.

Order—Ms. No. 1263, *L. & M., dated* 6*th April* 1932.

Some presidents of district boards have enquired as to what class of motor lorries should be treated as 'private lorries' for the purpose of issuing licences on payment of a nominal fee as directed in G.O. No. 781, L. & M., dated 29th February 1932. All presidents of district

24th January 1933]

boards are informed that the distinction intended by Government is between lorries plying for hire and those which do not so ply and that the lorries falling under the former category are those which must be granted a 'G' permit under rule 30 of the Madras Motor Vehicles Rules, 1923. If cases of evasion come to the notice of presidents of district boards, they should at once report the same to the District Magistrate concerned for necessary action.

(By order of the Government, Ministry of Local Self-Government)

E. CONRAN SMITH,
Secretary to Government.

To all Presidents of District Boards.
,, all Chairmen of Municipal Councils.
,, the Inspector of Municipal Councils and Local Boards.
,, the Examiner of Local Fund Accounts.
,, all District Magistrates (with copies of G.O. No. 781, L. & M., dated 29th February 1932).
,, the Law (General) Department.

APPENDIX II.

[Vide answer to question No. 475 asked by Mr. M. Devadasan at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 24th January 1933, page 173 supra.]

Name and description of the scheme.	Remarks.
1 Ghiriar project	Vide answer to question No. 618.
2 *Kallar project.*—This provided for the diversion of the Kallar stream which flows to the west by the construction of a tunnel and other connected works.	The project was not investigated in detail as it was found that the amount of water to be diverted was very small and the cost would be out of proportion to the possible increase in revenue and the work was not likely to be useful by way of famine relief. A combined Irrigation and Hydro-Electric scheme was considered later and dropped as it was not possible to effect a satisfactory settlement with the Travancore Darbar, and as there were other projects under consideration.
3 Project for the utilization of the surplus water of the Nambiyar by improving the Kovankulam anicut, the excavation of a channel therefrom and the construction of a new tank to be supplied by it to irrigate 2,000 acres. Estimated cost Rs. 1,87,000 and the anticipated return was Rs. 10,000.	The project was given up as the return was small and the water-supply precarious and as there were engineering difficulties.
4 *Parapar Scheme.*—This consisted in the diversion of Parapar and two other hill streams for improving irrigation facilities in the district at a cost of about Rs. 30,000.	The scheme was considered hopeless both on engineering and financial grounds.

[24th January 1933

	Name and description of the scheme.	Remarks.
5	*Papanasam Reservoir project.*—The proposal is to construct a reservoir on the Tambraparni in the Papanasam hills and to increase the supply to the anicuts across the river below.	Gaugings of the supply available were taken for a few years. Subsequently the scheme was held up pending the investigation of a combined irrigation and hydro-electric scheme. As it is not proposed to proceed with the hydro-electric scheme at present the question of working out an independent irrigation scheme is under examination by the local officers.
6	*Supply channel to the Ottapidaram Periyakulam and connected tanks.*—The scheme consists in the construction of an anicut across the Arakulam odai and the excavation of a channel therefrom to improve the supply to Ottapidaram Periyakulam and other connected rainfed tanks to augment supply to the existing ayacut of 598 acres and to extend irrigation to a small extent.	The proposal was dropped owing to the scanty supply available as ascertained from gaugings of the river taken for a series of years and as the scheme was unpromising financially. A smaller scheme for extending irrigation to 209 acres under Mandaikulam tank anicut is under consideration by local officers.

TAMIL NADU LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS

APPENDIX III.

[Vide answer to question No. 477 asked by Mr. M. Devadasan at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 24th January 1933, page 175 supra.]

Names of Main and Minor Basins with particulars regarding the Tank Restoration Scheme works in the Tinnevelly district.

	Name of district.	Name of main basin.	Name of minor basin.	Total area and the number of works to be investigated.		Area and the number of works which have been fully investigated, i.e., includes sanctioning of the estimate.		Number of works which have been executed in pursuance of the proposals and estimates prepared as a result of the investigation.	Number of works for which estimates have been prepared; but		Number of works in respect of which execution is in progress.
				Area in square miles.	Number of works.	Area in square miles.	Number of works.		Not sanctioned.	Sanctioned and not executed.	
1	Tinnevelly and Ramnad.	Vaippar	Arjunanadi ..	933	Fully investigated and executed.						
			Nichabanadi ..	668							
			Uppattur ..	300							
				* 1,901							
2	Tinnevelly ..	Upper Tambraparni ..	Uppodai ..	272	Fully investigated and executed.						
			Tinnevelly ..	1,120	668	584	348	317	32	† 7	24
			Chittar ..	500	268	444	238	236	2	..	2
3	Do. ..	Minor drainages into the gulf of Manar, South of the Tambraparni basin.		768	Taken up for investigation and when 23 works were under various stages of investigation further investigation was stopped.						
4	Do. ..	Lower Tambraparni ..		444	Not entered upon for investigation.						
5	Do. ..	Minor drainages into the sea between Vaippar and Lower Tambraparni basin.		328	Not entered upon for investigation.						

5,333 — 1,211 = 4,122 sq. miles in Tinnevelly district.

* Of the total area of 1,901 square miles in Vaippar basin, 690 square miles are in Tinnevelly district and 1,211 square miles in Ramnad district.

† Includes one estimate which has been recorded, investigation of the remaining work was stopped.

[24th January 1933

APPENDIX IV.

[Vide item VI—Papers laid on the table of the House—page 251 supra.]

FINANCE (SALARIES) DEPARTMENT.

REVISED SCALES OF PAY FOR SERVICES.

In answer to an interpellation at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 2nd November 1932, it was stated on behalf of Government that the proposals for the revision of salaries of services will in due course be placed on the table of the House. With reference to the above undertaking, two statements are attached to this note showing the existing and the proposed revised scales of pay in respect of Provincial Services (including posts outside the time-scale and intermediate posts) and in respect of certain of the Subordinate Services.

The recommendations of the Retrenchment Committee, and the action proposed to be taken thereon, the scope of the present revision proposals and their financial effect are briefly explained below.

Provincial Services.

2. The general principles on which the recent Retrenchment Committee based its recommendations and the extent to which these principles have been observed in formulating the present proposals are briefly mentioned in parallel columns below:—

Retrenchment Committee's recommendation.

(i) The general standard of pay should be a scale ranging from about 12 per cent to 30 per cent less than the existing scale.

(ii) In those services in which there are two clearly defined grades of appointments, one of which carries greater responsibilities and entails work of a different character from the other, there should be a junior and a senior scale, the latter of which would be open to entry from the former at about the seventh year of service and would overlap it for some years, so as to provide a reasonable scale of increments for those who could not be promoted to the senior scale so early.

(iii) In other departments, where the same differentiation in the nature of the posts cannot be made, a single time-scale should be sufficient.

Action proposed by Government.

(i) The percentage of reduction in each case has been stated in the detailed statements attached and will be found in the main to fall within the limits contemplated.

(ii) & (iii) For the services described in item (ii), the principle of two scales has been accepted, but on the compartmental system and not on the overlapping system as the latter system is considered suitable only for services such as the I.C.S., where the lower appointments are only feeder posts to the higher ones and form the training ground for the higher appointments in the service. It may be mentioned by way of explanation that the main difference between the two systems is, that under the compartmental system the senior scale of pay is a definite scale applicable to the senior posts whatever the method of recruitment, all officers appointed to the posts starting on the minimum of the scale (or such higher initial pay as is admissible under the

24th January 1933]

Retrenchment Committee's recommendation.	*Action proposed by Government.*
	rules) and their pay at any time depending on the length of service in that scale: while under the overlapping system an officer's pay depends upon his total length of service independently of how long he has held charge of one of the senior posts. Separate scales of pay for junior and senior appointments on the compartmental system have been suggested for the Madras Civil Service (Executive Branch), the Madras Engineering, Police, Industries and Medical Services. On the other hand, a single scale of pay has been suggested for the Madras Forest, Survey, Educational (Men's and Women's), Jail, Boiler and Co-operative Services. In these cases, the nature of the posts does not admit of a clear cut division into junior and senior appointments, but the senior officers who will draw the higher stages of pay in the single time-scale will normally hold the more responsible posts in the service.
(iv) In view of the fact that the incremental system of pay, although more expensive than the old graded system, has now been established for some years in the majority of services throughout India, this system should be retained; but the increments should be biennial instead of annual, on the ground that an annual increment of Rs. x gives a more expensive scale than a biennial increment of Rs. $2x$.	(iv) This recommendation has been accepted and proposals have been made accordingly. Adoption of biennial increments will result in an ultimate saving of at least 2 lakhs per annum.
(v) A greater measure of uniformity should be introduced in the pay of the different services, although the nature of the work and responsibility in a few services may warrant a rather high general level of emoluments than in the remainder.	(v) & (vi) The recommendation of the Committee has been borne in mind in framing revised scales of pay.
(vi) The number of different scales of pay in a single department should be examined with a view to reducing their number, if possible, and providing the same rates for those who possess similar qualifications.	
(vii) The system of selection grades should be altogether abolished. The theoretical justification for a selection grade was to supply some means of encouraging and rewarding special talent or to provide a small number of prize appointments in departments in which there were but few chances of promotion; in practice however promotion to selection grade posts is made rather on grounds of seniority than by selection and they are not infrequently utilized as a form of consolation for men of long service who have shown themselves unfit for further advancement.	(vii) The Government propose to accept the recommendation of the Committee.

[24th January 1933

One other matter not referred to by the Retrenchment Committee may also be mentioned here. Efficiency bars are now imposed at some stage or other in the various scales of pay of Provincial Services, but it is now proposed to abolish efficiency bars.

3. In the revised scales of pay proposed for the Provincial Services, the Government have kept in view the proposal accepted by the Retrenchment Committee that a higher starting pay should be allowed for the security services. The case of each service has been examined and it is proposed to start the pay of the future entrants to the posts of the Madras Civil Service (Executive Branch) at Rs. 250 for directly recruited men and at Rs. 300 for promoted men. For the Madras Civil Service (Judicial Branch) also, the starting pay proposed is Rs. 250. Similarly, in the case of Inspectors of Boilers, a starting pay of Rs. 250 is proposed (as against the existing starting pay of Rs. 400) in view of the qualifications and practical experience required of persons entering the service and the difficulties experienced in recruiting suitable and qualified persons to the service. For Inspectors of Excise also, a starting pay of Rs. 275 is proposed (as against the present starting pay of Rs. 325) as Excise is a revenue-producing department and the pay of Inspectors must be sufficient to shield them from temptation, since any dishonesty on their part will result in a direct loss of revenue to Government. For District Board Engineers also, the starting pay proposed is Rs. 250. For the Madras Police, Jail and Public Health Services, an initial pay of Rs. 220 is proposed and for other Provincial Services of Rs. 200. In the case of Civil Assistant Surgeons, however, a starting pay of Rs. 175 is proposed in view of the fact that these officers get additional income from private practice. For District Registrars, a starting pay of Rs. 150 is proposed for direct recruits if such recruitment is made, but promotees are to start on Rs. 200.

The view of the Retrenchment Committee was that a scale is determined by its initial figure and its rate of increment. The scale being thus fixed, the period should be settled with reference to the conditions and requirements of the service and the maximum then settles itself. Thus, for Deputy Collectors, the initial pay has been fixed at Rs. 250 and the increment at Rs. 50/2. A 19-year scale was considered suitable as representing a fair average length in view of the fact that recruitment was both by promotion and direct. The scale of pay proposed is accordingly Rs. 250—50/2—700. In the case of certain services however the proposals now submitted have deviated somewhat from a strict application of this principle in order to enable officers to reach a suitable maximum. Examples which may be mentioned are District Registrars and Civil Surgeons.

The existing scales of pay and the detailed scales of pay provisionally approved by Government for the various Provincial Services are mentioned in the statement annexed. The scales of pay generally follow those proposed by the Retrenchment Committee but modifications have been made in the maximum or minimum or the rate of increment, after detailed examination of the conditions of each service. The present

24th January 1933]

opportunity has also been taken to fix separate scales of pay for appointments in the general line and in the educational line of the Medical Department.

4. *Financial effect of the proposals.*—The Retrenchment Committee anticipated that the all-over reduction resulting from the revision of salaries for the Provincial Services will be about 20 per cent or about 17 lakhs per annum. The revised scales of pay proposed in the accompanying statements are expected to result in a saving of about $15\frac{1}{2}$ lakhs per annum which gives a reduction of about 20·8 per cent on the existing cost of the services. The above does not however include the savings from the revision of pay of posts outside the time-scales. There is also a large number of miscellaneous gazetted posts the revised scales of pay for many of which have been considered while the pay for certain others has still to be fixed. Revised rates of pay have also to be fixed for one or two services such as the Sanitary Engineering Service and the officers of the Electrical Department. The revised scales of pay fixed in these cases will in due course be communicated to the Legislative Council. When the revision is finished, it is anticipated that the savings anticipated by the Retrenchment Committee will be exceeded.

5. One or two general aspects of the proposals connected with the revision may also be mentioned here.

(i) In certain departments there are already posts intermediate between those of the officers on the ordinary time-scales and those of the heads of the departments—e.g., Conservators of Forests, Superintending Engineers, etc. But in other departments there are no such intermediate posts and the old method of providing an adequate opportunity for advancement to the officers in the service was by the provision of selection grades. The selection grade system has been condemned by the Retrenchment Committee, and the Government have accepted their view. In order to provide reasonable opportunity for advancement in respect of such services therefore the Government have decided, as recommended by the Retrenchment Committee, to constitute where necessary and possible, a limited number of specified posts in respect of which the work involved is sufficiently different in character or responsibility from that performed in the ordinary line into an intermediate grade. This has been done in the case of one post of Assistant Director now in charge of the Central Survey Office in the Survey Department, one post of Personal Assistant to the Inspector-General of Registration in the Registration Department, the posts of Principals, Presidency College and the Teachers' College, Saidapet, and two Deputy Directors of Public Instruction in the Educational Department; the Principal of the Veterinary College in the Veterinary Department; and the Principal of the Agricultural College and the Headquarters Deputy Director of Agriculture in the Agricultural Department.

(ii) The Retrenchment Committee endeavoured to present a complete picture of the standards of pay on which they thought that the

[24th January 1933

administration of the Province can be carried on under Provincial Autonomy and without the assistance of All-India Services, and they accordingly suggested revised rates of pay for certain Heads of Departments and other posts now held by All-India Service officers. The Government have agreed with the Retrenchment Committee that it is desirable now to fix the pay of such posts which will apply only when Provincial Service officers are appointed to them. Until this time comes, the pay and emoluments of All-India Service officers promoted to these posts including holders of 'listed' posts will be regulated by the orders of the Secretary of State in Council. The revised scales of pay in respect of such posts therefore merely express the intention of this Government and may not come into force for several years to come until the services are completely provincialized.

Subordinate Services.

6. As in the case of the Provincial Services, the recommendation of the recent Retrenchment Committee that a greater measure of uniformity should be introduced in the pay of the different services and that the number of different scales of pay in a single department should be examined with a view to reducing the number if possible and providing the same rates for those who possess similar qualifications has been borne in mind in framing revised scales of pay for Subordinate Services but the varying conditions of the services regarding the method and age of recruitment, the qualifications required, the nature of the work and the prospects of promotion, etc., do not permit of any large degree of uniformity. The number of classes of miscellaneous posts on different scales of pay are numerous in the case of Subordinate Services and an attempt has been made to reduce the number of these posts on different rates of pay though it has not been found possible to make any substantial reduction. In the case of the Subordinate Services also it is proposed to adopt the principle of biennial increments and to get rid of selection grades and efficiency bars.

The Retrenchment Committee were unable to suggest detailed new scales of pay for the Subordinate Services as they did for the Provincial Services owing to the number and complexity of the various subordinate time-scales. They confined themselves to suggesting reductions in accordance with the following graduated scale:—

Rs. 25 and below	Nil.
From Rs. 25 to Rs. 50	$3\frac{1}{8}$ per cent or $\frac{1}{2}$ anna in the rupee.
,, Rs. 50 to Rs. 100	$6\frac{1}{4}$ per cent or 1 anna in the rupee.
,, Rs. 100 to Rs. 150	$12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent or 2 annas in the rupee.
Above Rs. 150	$18\frac{3}{4}$ per cent or 3 annas in the rupee.

They did not contemplate these percentage reductions being applied exactly to existing scales, and indeed such a course would not be possible. But the scale represents the general level of reduction which they considered might be effected without detriment to the existing

24th January 1933]

standard of efficiency and they recommended that Government should pursue a more detailed enquiry into the subject on the above basis. The reduction suggested varies from nil to 18¾ per cent and they thought that this would lead to an all-over reduction of about 10 per cent in the case of officers of the Subordinate Services drawing over Rs. 25 as against 20 per cent for the Provincial Services and that the savings will amount to approximately Rs. 33 lakhs per annum.

7. *Pay of officers on Rs.* 25 *and below.*—The Government have decided that the recommendation of the Committee not to effect any reduction in the pay of officers on Rs. 25 and below need not be accepted, as these classes of officers have also derived great benefit from the fall in prices and that proposals may be worked out for new scales of pay with a moderate reduction. A small reduction has therefore been proposed in the case of peons, attenders, daffadars, police constables, forest-guards, teachers in elementary schools, etc. As the number of these officers is enormous, even a very slight percentage of reduction produces a large saving. For example, taking the case of peons, daffadars and attenders, though the reduction in existing cost is only 4·8 per cent the savings will amount ultimately to 2·31 lakhs per annum.

8. *Pay of ministerial establishments.*—The existing scales of pay for the lower grades of clerks in the mufassal is Rs. 35—35—1½—50—1—60 and in Madras city Rs. 40—40—1½—55—1—65. The Government have decided that the initial pay of clerks should be Rs. 30 for future entrants and that the lower grades of clerks in Madras should be on the same pay as clerks in the mufassal but should be allowed a Presidency allowance of Rs. 6–8–0 per mensem. The scales of pay for the various grades of clerks including the Secretariat and the offices of the heads of departments in the city are under consideration and the final decision arrived at will be communicated to the Council in due course.

9. *Financial effect.*—Revision of salaries has been completed in respect of the following Subordinate Services and the statement below shows the existing cost, the proposed cost and the savings involved:—

Posts, department or service.	Existing cost per annum.	Proposed cost per annum.	Savings per annum.	Percentage reduction.
	LAKHS.	LAKHS.	LAKHS.	
Peons, daffadars and attenders, in all departments in mufassal and Madras	47·81	45·50	2·31	4·8
Madras Revenue Subordinate Service	20·60	17·48	3·12	15·1
Madras Minor Irrigation Subordinate Service	1·74	1·60	·14	8·2
Settlement Department	·21	·18	·03	15·1
Madras Police Subordinate Service ..	92·92	88·65	4·27	4·6
Madras Excise Subordinate Service.	6·53	5·74	·79	12·1
Madras Forest Subordinate Service-	8·75	8·09	·66	7·6
Madras Registration Subordinate Service	9·85	8·55	1·30	13·2
Madras Educational Subordinate Service	25·49	19·86	5·63	22·1

Posts, department or service.	Existing cost per annum.	Proposed cost per annum.	Savings per annum.	Percentage reduction.
	LAKHS.	LAKHS.	LAKHS.	
Madras Veterinary Subordinate Service	3·50	2·96	·54	15·5
Madras Co-operative Subordinate Service	5·83	5·26	·57	9·7
Madras Engineering Subordinate Service	14·27	12·06	2·21	15·5
Total ..	237· 0	215·93	21·57	9·1

It will be observed that the total savings amount to 21·57 lakhs or a reduction of about 9·1 per cent in existing cost. The Retrenchment Committee took the net percentage of reduction in the case of Subordinate Services at about 10 per cent of the cost. The revision proposals referred to however result in a slightly lower percentage of savings, viz., 9·1, which is partly due to the fact that whereas the Retrenchment Committee recommended that no reduction should be made in the pay of officers on Rs. 25 and below, Government have considered that reduction may be made with moderation even in the case of these officers. The variations in the percentage of reduction in the existing cost for the different services is mainly due to the fact that some services have a larger number of comparatively higher paid posts than others which admit of a higher percentage of reduction.

The scales of pay relating to the Medical, Agricultural, Fisheries, Local Fund Audit, Government Press, Industries, Jails, Public Health and Survey Subordinate Services are still under consideration. The revised rates of pay for a number of miscellaneous posts have been examined while others are still under various stages of examination. The proposals of Government regarding the revised rates of pay for the above services and miscellaneous posts will in due course be communicated to the Legislative Council. When the revision is finished, it is likely that the savings of about 33 lakhs per annum under Subordinate Services anticipated by the Committee will be exceeded.

General remarks.

10. The question of the pay to be allowed to probationers for the various Provincial Services and non-gazetted services is under the consideration of Government.

Again, under Fundamental Rule 23, officers who hold permanent posts under Government in a substantive capacity will have the option of remaining on the existing rates of pay, and the reduced scales of pay will not therefore affect these officers so long as they hold those post or remain on the time-scales of pay applicable to them. It has also been decided by Government that a person who, though not the substantive holder of a post, has completed or is deemed to have compleeted his probation before the 15th August 1931, or where no probation has been prescribed, has officiated either for a continuous period of two years or for a period of two years out of a continuous period of

24th January 1933]

three years before the 15th August 1931, will be entitled to the existing rate of pay. In other cases including new entrants to services after the 15th August 1931, the revised scales will apply. The question whether any further classes of Government servants will be exempted from the application of the revised scales of pay as a matter of grace is still under the consideration of Government.

11. *Conclusion.*—It will be seen from the above that the savings from the revision of salaries will accrue gradually over a period of years, as pointed out by the Retrenchment Committee in paragraph 155 on page 65 of their report, and the full effect will not be obtained for some 25 or 30 years. The savings realized will however be substantial and will ultimately exceed the limit of 50 lakhs per annum suggested by the Retrenchment Committee. The lowering of the level of salaries will also result in due course in a corresponding reduction under the head of pensions.

C. E. JONES,
Additional Secretary to Government,
Finance Department.

I. PROVINCIAL SERVICES.

	Existing scales of pay.	Revised scales of pay.	Percentage of reduction in existing cost.
	RS.	RS.	
1. MADRAS CIVIL SERVICE (EXECUTIVE BRANCH)—			
Chief Secretary	3,750 *	2,250	40
First Member of the Board of Revenue.	3,750 *	2,250	40
Second Member of the Board of Revenue.	3,500 *	1,800—200/2—2,000, 3-year scale, average Rs. 1,960.	39·7
Third Member of the Board of Revenue.	3,000 *		
Collectors	1,275—2,500, average Rs. 1,969.	800—100/2—1,500, 15-year scale, average Rs. 1,1888/9. (Promotees are to start on Rs. 1,000.)	39·6
Deputy Collectors—			
Ordinary grade	300—40—500 (EB.)—50—850, 13-year scale, average Rs. 624.	250—50/2—700, 19-year scale, average Rs. 480. (Promotees are to start on Rs. 300.)	25
Selection grade	1,000—100—1,200, 3-year scale, average Rs. 1,173⅓. Combined average of ordinary and selection grades Rs. 640.		
2. MADRAS CIVIL SERVICE (JUDICIAL BRANCH)—			
[Revised scales of pay are not proposed for Judges of the High Court as the Local Government are not likely to have the power of fixing their pay.]			
District and Sessions Judges ..	Pay in the I.C.S. Senior scale—Rs. 1,275—2,250, average Rs. 1,838⅓.	800—100/2—1,500, 15-year scale, average Rs. 1,1888/9. (Promotees are to start on Rs. 1,000.)	35·3
Subordinate Judges—			
Ordinary grade	650—50—850, 5-year scale, average Rs. 796⅔.	550—50/2—700, 7-year scale, average Rs. 646⅔.	23·9
Selection grade	1,000—100—1,200, 3-year scale, average Rs. 1,173⅓. Combined average of ordinary and selection grades Rs. 850.		
District Munsifs	300—40—500 (E.B.)—50—600, 8-year scale, average Rs. 493⅓.	250—50/2—500, 11-year scale, average Rs. 400.	18·9
3. MADRAS POLICE SERVICE—			
Inspector-General of Police	2,500—125—3,000 * 5-year scale, average Rs. 2,866⅔.	1,500—150/2—1,800, 5-year scale, average Rs. 1,700.	40·7
Deputy Inspectors-General of Police.	1,750—100—2,150 * 5-year scale, average Rs. 2,043⅓.	1,100—100/2—1,300, 5-year scale, average Rs. 1,233⅓.	39·6
Senior appointments— District Superintendents of Police.	650—1,350 * Average Rs. 1,000.	700—50/2—1,000, 13-year scale, average Rs. 873⅓.	12·7
Junior appointments— Deputy Superintendents of Police.	Selection grade 800. Ordinary grade 300—20—500—500 (E.B.)—20—600—600—20—700. Probationers directly recruited draw Rs. 250 and Rs. 275 during their first two years giving a 25-year scale, average Rs. 480.	220—30/2—310—40/2—350—50/2—600, 19-year scale, average Rs. 4142/9. (Promotees to start on Rs. 250.)	13·7

4. Madras Jails Service—			
Inspector-General of Prisons ..	2,300—50—2,500 * 5-year scale, average Rs. 2,446⅔.	1,400—1/00/2—1,600, 5-year scale, average Rs. 1,533⅓.	37·4
Superintendents	Medical. / Non-Medical. † Class I (a)— Three posts. Rs. 700—50—950, 6-year scale, average Rs. 8668. / 600—50—1,000. 9-year scale, average Rs. 8532/3. † Class I (b)— Four posts. Rs. 550—50—700, 4-year scale, average Rs. 670. / 450—30—600, 6-year scale, average Rs. 550. † Class II— Six posts. Rs. 400—20—500 6-year scale, average Rs. 466⅔. / .. † Class III— One post .. Rs. 300—20—500, 11-year scale, average Rs. 4222/9. / .. † Class IV— One post. Rs. 300—15—450, 11-year scale, average Rs. 391⅔. / .. Average for one post in Jail Service (including temporary additions to pay) may be taken at about Rs. 671.	220—30/2—310—40/2—350—50/2—550—75/2—850. 25-year scale, average Rs. 500. (The revised scale is subject to the condition that no officer should be allowed to draw increments beyond Rs. 450 unless he holds charge of a Central Jail or Borstal School for at least six months and is considered by the Inspector-General of Prisons fit to continue to hold such charge.)	25
5. Madras Excise Service—			
Commissioner of Excise when not held by a Member of the Board of Revenue or I.C.S.		1,500—150/2—1,800, 5-year scale, average Rs. 1,700.	
Deputy Commissioners of Excise ..	1,400—75—1,550, 3-year scale, average Rs. 1,530.	800—100/2—1,000, 5-year scale, average Rs. 933⅓.	39·
Assistant Commissioners— Ordinary grade	600—50—900, 7-year scale.	500—50/2—700, 9-year scale, average Rs. 6244/9.	28·2
Selection grade	1,000—100—1,200, 3-year scale. Combined average Rs. 872.		
Inspectors— First grade	525	425	
Second „	425	375	
Third „	375	325	
Fourth „	325	275	
	Average .. 408	346	15·2

[Note.—If it is decided to introduce direct recruitment, direct recruits should draw Rs. 225 for the first two years of their service and then come on to the ordinary scale at Rs. 275.]

* No pay has been fixed for a Provincial Service officer holding the post. The pay given is that drawn by an All-India Service officer appointed to the post.

† For details, see page, 81–88 of the Madras Services Manual, Volume I.

I. PROVINCIAL SERVICES—*cont.*

—	Existing scales of pay.	Revised scales of pay.	Percentage of reduction in existing cost.
	RS.	RS.	
6. MADRAS SURVEY SERVICE—			
Director of Survey	1,500—100—1,800, 4-year scale, average Rs. 1,740.	1,000—100/2—1,200, 5-year scale, average Rs. 1,133⅓.	34·9
Deputy Director of Survey *		650—50/2—850, * 9-year scale, average Rs. 774 4/9.	
	Assistant Directors of Survey—		
Ordinary grade	300—40—500 (E.B.)—50—850, 13-year scale, average Rs. 624.	200—30/2—260—40/2—300—50/2—600, 19-year scale, average Rs. 404 4/9.	41·6
Slection grade	1,000—100—1,200, 3-year scale, average Rs. 1,173⅓. Combined average of ordinary and selection grades Rs. 693.		
7. MADRAS FOREST SERVICE—			
Chief Conservator of Forests	2,500—125—2,750, † 3-year scale, average Rs. 2,716⅔.	1,400—100/2—1,600, 5-year scale, average Rs. 1,533⅓.	34·9
Conservators of Forests	1,750—100—2,150, † 5-year scale, average Rs. 2,043⅓.	1,000—100/2—1,200, 5-year scale, average Rs. 1,133⅓.	44·5
Madras Forest Service officers—Extra Assistant Conservators of Forests.	250—25—900, 27-year scale, average Rs. 531⅔.	200—30/2—260—40/2—500—50/2—700, 25-year scale, average Rs. 422 2/9.	20·6
8. MADRAS REGISTRATION SERVICE—			
Inspector-General of Registration ..	1,250—50—1,500, 6-year scale, average Rs. 1,416⅔.	1,000—100/2—1,200, 5-year scale, average Rs. 1,133⅓.	20
Personal Assistant to the Inspector-General of Registration.	Grade pay plus Madras house allowance.	600—50/2—800 (without any allowances), 9-year scale, average Rs. 724 4/9.	
District Registrars	250—30—400—50—500, 8-year scale and two selection appointments on Rs. 600 and 700, average Rs. 429.	150—25/2—200—30/2—320—40/2—400—50/2—500, 21-year scale, average Rs. 321 1/9. (Promotees to start on Rs. 200.)	25·2
9. MADRAS EDUCATIONAL SERVICE (MEN'S BRANCH)—			
Director of Public Instruction ..	2,500—100—3,000 † 6-year scale, average Rs. 2,833⅓.	1,500—150/2—1,800, 5-year scale, average Rs. 1,700.	40
Deputy Directors (2) and Principals of the Presidency College, Madras, and the Teachers' College, Saidapet.	Now on grade pay *plus* special pay of Rs. 100 for the Principal of the Presidency College and Rs. 75 for others *plus* Madras house allowance for officers in Madras.	800—100/2—1,000 (without any special pay or Madras house allowance), 5-year scale, average Rs. 933⅓.	
Administrative section (senior scale) and Collegiate section.	250—25—500 (E.B.)—50—800, 17-year scale, average Rs. 549 4/9.	200—30/2—260—40/2—500—50/2—700, 25-year scale, average Rs. 422 2/9.	23·2
Junior scale	250—25—500, 11-year scale, average Rs. 402 7/9.	There will not be a junior scale in future. The posts are to be relegated to the Subordinate Educational Service.	
10. MADRAS EDUCATIONAL SERVICE (WOMEN'S BRANCH)—			
Administrative section—			
Higher scale	200—20—400 (E.B.)—25—500, 15-year scale, average Rs. 370.	200—30/2—500, 21-year scale, average Rs. 346⅔.	25·8
Lower scale	3 on 200—20—440, 13-year scale, average Rs. 341 1/3		
Collegiate section—			
Senior scale	250—25—500—50—750, 16-year scale, average Rs. 527 4/9.		
Junior scale	200—20—400 (E.B.)—25—500, 15-year scale, average Rs. 370.		

[NOTE.—The posts now in the lower scale in the Administrative section will in future be relegated to the Subordinate Educational Service.]

* [NOTE.—The Assistant Director of Survey in charge of the Central Survey office is drawing his grade pay plus Rs. 50 special pay plus Madras house allowance. It is proposed to place the post on a special scale of pay without any allowances.]

† No pay has been fixed for a Provincial Service officer holding the post. The pay given is that drawn by an All-India Service officer appointed to the post

11. MADRAS MEDICAL SERVICE—				
Surgeon-General		3,000 *	1,500—150/2—1,800, 5-year scale, average Rs. 1,700.	43·3
General Branch—				
Junior appointments—				
Assistant Surgeons		200—15—350—20—450, 16-year scale, average Rs. 338 8/9.	Men : 175—25/2—400, 19-year scale, average Rs. 290.	14·5
			Women : 175—20/2—275—25/2—400, 21-year scale, average Rs. 285.	15·9
Senior appointments—				
Civil Surgeons	75 per cent on	500—50—900, 9-year scale, average Rs. 753 1/3.	450—75/2—750, 9-year scale, average Rs. 636 2/3.	21·9
	25 per cent on	1,000. Combined average Rs. 815.		
Assistant Surgeons in the King Institute, Guindy.		300—15—450—20—650, 21-year scale, average Rs. 475.	200—25/2—300—30/2—480, 21-year scale ,average Rs. 336 8/9.	29
Teaching appointments—				
Clinical—				
Tutors or Assistants	18 on	200—15—350—20—450, 16-year scale, average Rs. 338 8/9.	18 on 200—25/2—300, 9-year scale, average Rs. 262 2/9.	19·5
Lecturers— Civil Surgeon's cadre	3 on	500—50—900, 9-year scale, average Rs. 753 1/3.	19 on 310—30/2—400—40/2—480, 11-year scale, average Rs. 412.	
Assistant Surgeon's cadre.	16 on	200—15—350—20—450, 16-year scale, average Rs. 338 8/9.		
Professors	7 on	500—50—900, 9-year scale, average Rs. 753 1/3.	7 on 500—75/2—800, 9-year scale, average Rs. 686 2/3.	
Non-clinical—				
Tutors or Assistants	3 on	250—10—350, 11-year scale, average Rs. 311 1/9.	17 on 220—30/2—340, 9-year scale, average Rs. 294 2/3.	
	4 on	350—20—550—25—800, 21-year scale, average Rs. 575.		
	10 on	200—15—350—20—450, 16-year scale, average Rs. 338 8/9.		
Lecturers	6 on	350—20—550—25—800, 21-year scale, average Rs. 575.	15 on 360—40/2—480—50/2—580, 11-year scale, average Rs. 492.	
	9 on	200—15—350—20—450, 16-year scale, average Rs. 338 8/9.		
Professors	4 on	700—100/2—1,200, 11-year scale, average Rs. 1,000.	11 on 600—75/2—900, 9-year scale, average Rs. 786 2/3.	
	5 on	500—50—900, 9-year scale, average Rs. 753 1/3.		
	1 on	1,100—50—1,600, 11-year scale, average Rs. 1,405 5/9.		
	1 on	625—1,150, average Rs. 965.		

NOTE.—1. In connexion with the revision of pay of the officers in the Madras Medical Service, the Surgeon-General pointed out that, in existing conditions, a Civil Assistant Surgeon selected for ability for an educational post ranked as a Civil Surgeoncy has to be promoted as Civil Surgeon even though he may be junior in the service to many in the general line who have not become Civil Surgeons. To avoid the administrative difficulties inherent in such an arrangement, he suggested the formation of a separate teaching cadre on separate scales of pay, to which officers could be seconded and if necessary later revert to their original places in the general line. The proposals of the Surgeon-General have been examined and it is proposed to fix separate scales of pay for clinical and non-clininal appointments in the educational line for professors, lecturers, and tutors or assistants. The scales of pay proposed for the non-clinical appointments, in respect of which private practice is entirely barred, are in excess of those proposed for the clinical appointments, in respect of which a limited private practice is allowed : and the latter are in turn higher than the revised scales for Civil Assistant Surgeons or Civil Surgeons in the regular line. The proposals have been framed so as to secure approximately the same amount of savings as would have been realized had the rates of pay of the various appointments been revised on the basis of the existing system.

2. The exact number of posts to be included under the categories of tutors, lecturers and professors has not yet been finally decided.

* No pay has been fixed for a Provincial Service officer holding the post. The pay given is that drawn by an All-India Service officer appointed to the post.

I. PROVINCIAL SERVICES—*cont.*

—	Existing scales of pay.	Revised scales of pay.	Percentage of reduction in existing cost.
	RS.	RS.	
12. MADRAS PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE— Director of Public Health—			
I.M.S. officer	2,100—60—2,400, 6-year scale, average Rs. 2,300.	1,300—100/2—1,500, 5-year scale, average Rs. 1,433⅓.	37·7 compared to existing cost for I.M.S. Director.
Non-I.M.S. officer	1,500—50—1,750, 6-year scale, average Rs. 1,666⅔.		14 compared to existing cost for non-I.M.S. Director.
Assistant Directors of Public Health..	600—50—1,200, 13-year scale, average Rs. 953⅓.	600—100/2—1,000, 9-year scale, average Rs. 848 8/9.	10·9
First-class Health Officers	250—20—450 (E.B.)—25—600, 17-year scale, average Rs. 440 5/9.	220—30/2—340—40/2—580, 21-year scale, average Rs. 396.	10·1
13. MADRAS AGRICULTURAL SERVICE— Director—			
Indian Agricultural Service officers.	2,000—50—2,250, 6-year scale, average Rs. 2,166⅔.	1,200—100/2—1,400, 5-year scale, average Rs. 1,333⅓.	38·5 compared to existing cost for I.A.S. Director.
Madras Agricultural Service officers.	1,250—50—1,500, 6-year scale, average Rs. 14,16⅔.		5·9 compared to existing cost for non-I.A.S. Director.
Headquarters Deputy Director of Agriculture	Grade pay *plus* Madras house allowance.	800—100/2—1,000 (without any special pay or Madras house allowance), 5-year scale, average Rs. 933⅓.	
and			
Principal, Agricultural College, Coimbatore.	Grade pay *plus* special pay of Rs. 75.		
Madras Agricultural Service—			
General Branch { 41 posts on ..	250—25—750, 21-year scale, average Rs. 500.	48 on 200—30/2—260—40/2—500—50/2—700, 25-year scale, average Rs. 422 2/9.	22·3
General Branch { 5 posts on ..	800—25—1,000, 9-year scale, average Rs. 926.		
Engineering Branch—2 posts on ..	250—20—750, 26-year scale, average Rs. 500. Combined average Rs. 543·2.		
14. MADRAS VETERINARY SERVICE— Director—			
Indian Veterinary Service Director.	1,700—100—2,200, 6-year scale, average Rs. 2,033⅓.	1,200—100/2—1,400, 5-year scale, average Rs. 1,333⅓.	34·4 compared to existing cost for Indian Veterinary Service Director.
Madras Veterinary Service Director.	1,250—50—1,500, 6-year scale, average Rs. 1,416⅔.		5·9 compared to existing cost for non-Indian Veterinary Service Director.
Principal, Veterinary College	Grade pay *plus* Rs. 50 special pay *plus* Madras house allowance.	800—100/2—1,000, (without any special pay or Madras house allowance), 5-year scale, average Rs. 933⅓.	
District Veterinary Officers—			
Ordinary grade	250—25—750, 21-year scale, average Rs. 500.	200—30/2—260—40/2—700, 27-year scale, average Rs. 411 1/9.	24
Selection grade	800—25—1,000, 9-year scale, average Rs. 926		

15. MADRAS CO-OPERATIVE SERVICE—			
Registrar of Co-operative Societies ..	I.C.S. senior scale *plus* Rs. 200. *	1,200—100/2—1,400, 5-year scale, average Rs. 1,333 1/3.	38·5
Joint Registrar of Co-operative Societies	1,050—50—1,200, 4-year scale, average Rs. 1,170.	700—100/2—1,000, 7-year scale, average Rs. 893 1/3.	23·6
Deputy Registrars of Co-operative Societies	300—30—450—500 (E.B.)—50—750. 12-year scale, average Rs. 570.	200—30/2—260—40/2—500—50/2—700, 25-year scale, average Rs. 422 2/9.	25·8
16. MADRAS INDUSTRIES SERVICE—			
Director of Industries	I.C.S. senior scale *plus* 250 *	1,200—100/2—1,400, 5-year scale, average Rs. 1,333 1/3.	39·9
Deputy Director of Industries ..	750—50—1,500, 16-year scale, average Rs. 1,166 2/3.	700—100/2—1,000, 7-year scale, average Rs. 893 1/3.	23·4
Senior appointments—			
Industrial Engineer	750—25—1,000, 11-year scale, average Rs. 902 7/9.	420—30/2—600—50/2—700, 17-year scale, average Rs. 569 1/3.	20·8
Principal, School of Technology ..	250—25—500—50—800, 17-year scale, average Rs. 549 5/9.		
Principal, School of Arts and Crafts.	500—550—50/2—600—50—800—800—50—1,000, 13-year scale, average Rs. 794 4/9,		
Assistant Director (Textiles) and Principal, Government Textile Institute.	600—50—900, 7-year scale, average Rs. 796 2/3.		
Inspector of Industrial Schools ..	600—50—1,000, 9-year scale, average Rs. 853 1/3.		
Oil Chemist and Soap Expert ..	500—50—750, 6-year scale, average Rs. 666 2/3.		
Sericultural Expert	250—25—650, 17-year scale, average Rs. 467 7/9.		
Junior appointments—			
Assistant Industrial Engineers ..	300—15—450, 11-year scale, average Rs. 391 2/3.	200—30/2—410, 15-year scale, average Rs. 316 2/3.	
Senior Lecturer, School of Technology.	200—20—500, 16-year scale, average Rs. 366 2/3.		
Superintendent, Leather Trades Institute.	300—25—600, 13-year scale, average Rs. 476 2/3.		
Leather Research Chemist	300—20—500, 11-year scale, average Rs. 422 2/3. Combined average Rs. 559.	Combined average for senior and junior appointments Rs. 443.	

Remarks.—Revised scale of pay is not proposed for the Leather Expert as the post is not likely to be continued after the present incumbent retires.

17. MADRAS FISHERIES SERVICE—			
Director of Fisheries	750—30—1,200, 16-year scale, average Rs. 1,000.	600—75/2—900, 9-year scale, average Rs. 786 2/3.	21·3
Assistant Director (Coast)	250—25—500—50—750, 16-year scale, average Rs. 527 7/9.	200—30/2—260—40/2—500, 17-year scale, average Rs. 360.	14
Assistant Director (Inland)	250—25—500, 11-year scale, average Rs. 402 7/9.		
Assistant Director (Pearl and Chank Fisheries).	200—20—400, 11-year scale, average Rs. 322 2/9. Combined average for the three posts Rs. 418.		

Remarks.—There is a temporary post of Assistant Biologist on Rs. 250 per mensem. If the post is continued after 31st March 1933, the minimum of the revised scale, viz., Rs. 200, will apply.

* No pay has been fixed for a Provincial Service Officer holding the post. The pay given is that drawn by an All-India Service officer appointed to the post.

I. PROVINCIAL SERVICES—*cont.*

—	Existing scales of pay.	Revised scales of pay.	Percentage of reduction in existing cost.
	RS	RS.	
18. MADRAS BOILER SERVICE—			
Chief Inspector of Boilers	700—30—1,000, 11-year scale, average Rs. 883⅓.	600—75/2—900, 9-year scale, average Rs. 786⅔.	10·9
Inspectors of Boilers	400—30—700, 11-year scale, average Rs. 583⅓.	250—30/2—520—40/2—600, 23-year scale, average Rs. 413⅓.	29·1
19. MADRAS FACTORY SERVICE—			
Chief Inspector of Factories	700—50—1,200, 11-year scale, average Rs. 1,005 5/9.	600—75/2—900, 9-year scale, average Rs. 786⅔.	21·8
Assistant Inspector	250—10—350, 11-year scale, average Rs. 311 1/9.	200—30/2—410, 15-year scale, average Rs. 316⅔.	1·8 increase in cost.
Inspectors of Factories..	400—30—700, 11-year scale, average Rs. 583 1/9.	200—30/2—440—40/2—600, 25-year scale, average Rs. 377 7/9.	35·2

[NOTE.—Though there is a slight increase in cost in the scale of pay proposed for Assistant Inspector, normally there will be no extra cost as the officer will be promoted as Inspector before he reaches the maximum of the scale for Assistant Inspector.]

—	Existing scales of pay.	Revised scales of pay.	Percentage of reduction in existing cost.
20. MADRAS ENGINEERING SERVICE—			
Chief Engineers	2,750—125—3,000, * 3-year scale, average Rs. 2,966⅔.	1,500—150/2—1,800, 5-year scale, average Rs. 1,700.	42·7
Superintending Engineers	1,750—100—2,150, * 5-year scale, average Rs. 2,043⅓.	1,000—100/2—1,200, 5-year scale, average Rs. 1,133⅓.	44·5
Junior appointments—			
Assistant Engineers: Superintendent, Divi Pumping Station.	250—20—550 (E.B.)—20—750, 26-year scale, average Rs. 472⅔.		
Assistant Executive Engineers, Junior Superintendents, Public Works Workshops, Dowlaishweram and Bezwada, and Assistant Superintendents, Public Works Workshops, Madras.	375—50—525—50/2—575—50—625—50/2—675—50—975, 15-year scale, average Rs. 787.	200—30/2—380—40/2—500, 19-year scale, average Rs. 353⅓.	34·3
Assistant Superintendent, Public Works Stores, Madras.	300—20—500, 11-year scale, average Rs. 422 2/9.		
Senior appointments—			
Executive Engineers and General Superintendent, Public Works Workshops and Stores, Madras.	625—50/2—675—50—725—50/2—775—50—1,025—50/2—1,075—50—1,275—50/2—1,375, 21-year scale, average Rs. 1,059.	500—50/2—850, 15-year scale, average Rs. 694 4/9.	34·4
21. MADRAS DISTRICT BOARD ENGINEERING SERVICE—			
Second grade	19 on 400—50—650, 6-year scale, average Rs. 566⅔.	19 on 250—50/2—600, 15-year scale, average Rs. 444 4/9.	
First grade	5 on 700—100—1,000, 4-year scale, average Rs. 940	6 on 650—50/2—850, 9 -year scale, average Rs. 774 4/9.	16·5
Selection grade	1 on 1,000—100—1,200, 3-year scale, average Rs. 1,173⅓.		

* No pay has been fixed for a Provincial Service officer holding the post. The pay given is that drawn by an All-India Service officer appointed to the post.

II. SUBORDINATE SERVICES.

1. Menial Establishments.

Posts.	Existing scales of pay.	RS.	Revised scales of pay.	RS.
1. (*a*) Peons in the mufassal establishment.	First 3 years	12	First 4 years	12
	Next 3 ,, ...	13	Next 4 ,, ...	13
	,, 4 ,, ...	14	,, 5 ,, ...	14
	,, 4 ,, ...	15	,, 6 ,, ...	15
	,, 5 ,, ...	16	,, 6 ,, ...	16
	,, 6 ,, ...	17	Over 25 years (say for 5 years).	17
	Over 25 years (say for 5 years).	18	Average ..	14·7
	Average ..	15·4	Reduction on existing cost 4·5 per cent.	
(*b*) Peons in the Madras City.	First 4 years	15	Same as the scale shown above for peons in the mufassal, plus a Presidency allowance of Rs. 2–8–0 per mensem.	
	Next 4 ,, ...	16		
	,, 5 ,, ...	17		
	,, 6 ,, ...	18		
	,, 6 ,, ...	19		
	Over 25 years (say for 5 years).	20	Average cost Rs. 17·2	
	Average ..	17·7	Reduction on existing cost 3 per cent.	
2. Daffadars	*Mufassal*— 25 on Rs. 18—1 (biennial)—23 (11-year scale, average Rs. 21).		Rs. 17—1 (biennial)—22 (average Rs. 20) with a Presidency allowance of Rs. 2–8-0 per mensem to daffadars in the city.	
	Madras City— 52 on Rs. 20—1 (biennial)—25 (11-year scale, average Rs. 23).		Reduction in existing cost 3 per cent.	

II. SUBORDINATE SERVICES—*cont.*

Posts.	Existing scales of pay.	Revised scales of pay.
	1. Menial Establishments—*cont.*	
3. Attenders	*Mufassal*— 553 on Rs. 20—1—35 (16-year scale, average Rs. $28\frac{3}{4}$). *Madras City*— 260 on Rs. 23—23—23—1—35 (16-year scale, average Rs. 30).	Rs. 19—2/2—25—1/2—30 (17-year scale, average Rs. 25) with a Presidency allowance of Rs. 2–8–0 for attenders in the Madras City. Reduction in existing cost 11·5 per cent.
	2. Madras Revenue Subordinate Service.	
1. Tahsildars (including Huzur Sarishtadars).	Rs. 200—10—300, 11-year scale. Average Rs. $261\frac{1}{9}$.	Rs. 175—15/2—250, 11-year scale. Average Rs. 220. Reduction = $15\frac{3}{4}$ per cent.
2. Deputy Tahsildars and Sub-Magistrates (including English Head clerks).	Rs. 150—5—200, 11-year scale. Average Rs. $180\frac{5}{9}$.	Rs. 125—10/2—175, 11-year scale. Average Rs. 155. Reduction = 14 per cent.
Probationary Deputy Tahsildars.	Rs. 125.	Rs. 100.
3. Miscellaneous posts in the Revenue Department—		
(*a*) Treasurers in certain Treasury Deputy Collectors' offices (employed in stations where there is no branch of the Imperial Bank of India).	Rs. 150.	Rs. 125. Reduction in existing cost $16\frac{2}{3}$ per cent.

(*b*) Head Accountants in Collectorates' offices (Treasury Deputy Collectors' offices).	Rs. 125.	Rs. 100. Reduction in existing cost 20 per cent.
(*c*) Head Accountants in taluk offices and Taluk Sarishtadars.	Rs. 100.	Rs. 85. Reduction in existing cost 15 per cent.
(*d*) Head clerks in I.C.S. Division offices, Vernacular Head clerks in Collectors' offices, second Accountants in Collectors' offices and certain Treasurers in Treasury Deputy Collectors' offices.	Rs. 90.	Rs. 75. Reduction in existing cost $16\frac{2}{3}$ per cent.
(*e*) Head clerks in non-I.C.S. Division offices.	Rs. 80.	Rs. 70. Reduction in existing cost $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.
(*f*) Shroffs	6 on Rs. 65.	6 on Rs. 55. Reduction 15·4 per cent.
	6 on Rs. 35—35—$1\frac{1}{2}$—50—1—60. Average Rs. $47\frac{1}{12}$.	6 on Rs. 30—3/2—42—2/2—50. Average Rs. 41. Reduction 12·9 per cent.
	365 on Rs. 20—1—35. Average Rs. $28\frac{3}{4}$.	365 on Rs. 20—$\frac{2}{2}$—24—$\frac{1}{2}$—30. Average Rs. $25\frac{1}{2}$. Reduction 11·2 per cent.

II. SUBORDINATE SERVICES—*cont.*

Posts.	Extending scales of pay.	Revised scales of pay.
3. Madras Minor Irrigation Subordinate Service.		
1. Supervisors (12)	Rs. 150—5—200—10—220 (E.B. at 200), 13-year scale. Average Rs. 191$\frac{2}{9}$.	Rs. 125—10/2—175—15/2—190, 13-year scale. Average Rs. 162$\frac{5}{9}$. Reduction = 15 per cent.
2. Overseers (124)	Rs. 50—2$\frac{1}{2}$—100, 21-year scale. Average Rs. 75.	Rs. 50—4/2—90, 21-year scale. Average Rs. 69$\frac{5}{9}$. Reduction = 7·3 per cent.
3. Clerk-draughtsmen (16) ..	Rs. 35—35—1$\frac{1}{2}$—50—1—60, 22-year scale. Average Rs. 47$\frac{1}{12}$.	The scale which may be finally approved for clerks.
4. Maistris (2)	2 on Rs. 30.	2 on Rs. 28. Reduction = 6·7 per cent.
5. Lascars (137)	Rs. 12—18. Average Rs. 15·4.	Rs. 12—17, the scale applicable to peons. Average Rs. 14·7.
4. Subordinates in the Settlement Department.		
1. Sarishtadars	4 on Rs. 200—10—300, 11-year scale. Average Rs. 261$\frac{1}{9}$.	4 on Rs. 175—$\frac{15}{2}$—250, 11-year scale. Average Rs. 220. Reduction = 15·7 per cent.
2. Supervisors	4 on Rs. 150—5—200, 11-year scale. Average Rs. 180$\frac{5}{9}$.	4 on Rs. 125—$\frac{10}{2}$—175, 11-year scale. Average Rs. 155. Reduction = 14·1 per cent.

II. SUBORDINATE SERVICES.

Posts.	Existing scales of pay.		Revised scales of pay.	
	1. Menial Establishments.			
		RS.		RS.
1. (*a*) Peons in the mufassal establishment.	First 3 years	12	First 4 years	12
	Next 3 ,, ...	13	Next 4 ,, ...	13
	,, 4 ,, ...	14	,, 5 ,, ...	14
	,, 4 ,, ...	15	,, 6 ,, ...	15
	,, 5 ,, ...	16	,, 6 ,, ...	16
	,, 6 ,, ...	17	Over 25 years (say for 5 years).	17
	Over 25 years (say for 5 years).	18	Average ..	14·7
	Average ..	15·4	Reduction on existing cost 4·5 per cent.	
(*b*) Peons in the Madras City.	First 4 years	15	Same as the scale shown above for peons in the mufassal, plus a Presidency allowance of Rs. 2–8–0 per mensem.	
	Next 4 ,, ...	16		
	,, 5 ,, ...	17		
	,, 6 ,, ...	18		
	,, 6 ,, ...	19		
	Over 25 years (say for 5 years).	20	Average cost Rs. 17·2	
	Average ..	17·7	Reduction on existing cost 3 per cent.	
2. Daffadars	*Mufassal*— 25 on Rs. 18—1 (biennial)—23 (11-year scale, average Rs. 21).		Rs. 17—1 (biennial)—22 (average Rs. 20) with a Presidency allowance of Rs. 2–8-0 per mensem to daffadars in the city.	
	Madras City— 52 on Rs. 20—1 (biennial)—25 (11-year scale, average Rs. 23).		Reduction in existing cost 3 per cent.	

(*b*) Head Accountants in Collectorates' offices (Treasury Deputy Collectors' offices).	Rs. 125.	Rs. 100. Reduction in existing cost 20 per cent.
(*c*) Head Accountants in taluk offices and Taluk Sarishtadars.	Rs. 100.	Rs. 85. Reduction in existing cost 15 per cent.
(*d*) Head clerks in I.C.S. Division offices, Vernacular Head clerks in Collectors' offices, second Accountants in Collectors' offices and certain Treasurers in Treasury Deputy Collectors' offices.	Rs. 90.	Rs. 75. Reduction in existing cost $16\frac{2}{3}$ per cent.
(*e*) Head clerks in non-I.C.S. Division offices.	Rs. 80.	Rs. 70. Reduction in existing cost $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.
(*f*) Shroffs	6 on Rs. 65.	6 on Rs. 55. Reduction 15·4 per cent.
	6 on Rs. 35—35—$1\frac{1}{2}$—50—1—60. Average Rs. $47\frac{1}{12}$.	6 on Rs. 30—3/2—42—2/2—50. Average Rs. 41. Reduction 12·9 per cent.
	365 on Rs. 20—1—35. Average Rs. $28\frac{3}{4}$.	365 on Rs. 20—$\frac{2}{2}$—24—$\frac{1}{2}$—30. Average Rs. $25\frac{1}{2}$. Reduction 11·2 per cent.

		Men in the Madras City Police to draw the same rates of pay as in the mufassal with a Presidency allowance of Rs. $1\frac{1}{2}$ per mensem and a special pay of Rs. $4\frac{1}{2}$ per mensem. Reduction 3 per cent.
5. Officers of the Harbour Police and the C.I.D.	Same rates of pay as for officers in the regular forces.	
	RS.	RS.
6. Havildars-Major	45.	45.
7. Jamadar	45—5/3—65	45—5/3—65
8. Head sowar	37	37
9. Sowars	24—1/3—30—1/4—32	24—1/3—30—1/4—32
10. Malabar Special Police—		
(i) Constables	20—1/2—25	20—1/2—25
(ii) Naicks..	30—1/2—35	30—1/2—35
(iii) Havildars	35—1/2—40	35—1/2—40
(iv) Havildars-Major ..	40—1/2—45	40—1/2—45
(v) Jamadars	65—5/2—80	65—5/2—80
(vi) Subadars	125—5/2—150	125—5/2—150
11. Miscellaneous posts—		
(*a*) Photographer in the C.I.D.	150—5/2—175	125—5/2—150
(*b*) Photographer in the Central Crime Branch.	85—4—125	75—5/2—100
Boat crew establishment—		
(*c*) Drivers ..	40—1—45 35—1—40	40—2/2—44—1/2—45 35—2/2—39—1/2—40
(*d*) Syrangs	25—25—25—1—35	25—2/3—27—2/2—35

II. SUBORDINATE SERVICES—*cont.*

Posts.	Existing scales of pay.	Revised scales of pay.
	MADRAS POLICE SUBORDINATE SERVICE—*cont.*	
	Mufassal—cont.	
11. Miscellaneous posts—*cont.*	RS.	RS.
Boat crew establishment—*cont.*		
(*e*) Tindals	20—1/2—25	20—1/2—25
(*f*) Lascars	$17\frac{1}{2}$—1/2—20—1/5—21—1/5—22	$17\frac{1}{2}$—$1\frac{1}{2}$/2—19—1/2—20—1/5—22
(*g*) Boatmen	$17\frac{1}{2}$—1/2—20—1/5—21—1/5—22	$17\frac{1}{2}$—$1\frac{1}{2}$/2—19—1/2—20—1/5—22
(*h*) Instructor in Plan-drawing, Training School, Vellore.	100—$2\frac{1}{2}$—125	85—3/2—100
(*i*) Riding Instructor ..	40—2—50	40—4/2—48—2/2—50
(*j*) Munshi for probationers.	60—3—75	55—3/2—61—4/2—65
(*k*) Librarian	20—1—35	19—2/2—25—1/2—30
(*l*) Buglers and bellows boys.	Same rates of pay as for constables.	
(*m*) Sub-Assistant Surgeons and compounders.	Same scales of pay as in the Medical department.	
(*n*) Nursing orderlies ..	12—18	12—17 (the scale applicable to peons).
(*o*) Totis	10 to $13\frac{1}{2}$	10 to $13\frac{1}{2}$

6. MADRAS EXCISE SUBORDINATE SERVICE.

Posts.	Existing	RS.	Revised	RS.
1. Assistant Inspectors ..	First grade	200	First grade	175
	Second grade	175	Reduction 12·5 per cent.	

Post	Existing	Rs.	Proposed	Rs.
	Third grade	150	Second grade	150
			Reduction 14·2 per cent.	
	Combined average Rs. 172·5.		Third grade	125
			Reduction 16·7 per cent.	
			Combined average Rs. 147·5.	
			Reduction in existing cost 14·5 per cent.	
2. Laboratory Assistants ..	First grade, one post on Rs. 200—$12\frac{1}{2}$—300 (9-year scale, average Rs. $263\frac{1}{3}$).		First grade, Rs. 175—15/2—250 (11-year scale, average Rs. 220). Reduction 16·4 per cent.	
	Second grade, one post on Rs. 120—$7\frac{1}{2}$—180 (9-year scale, average Rs. 158).		Second grade, Rs 100—10/2—150 (11-year scale, average Rs. 130). Reduction 17·7 per cent.	
	Third grade, one post on Rs. 80—5—100 (5-year scale, average Rs. $94\frac{1}{3}$).		Third grade, Rs. 70—5/2—85 (7-year scale, average Rs. $79\frac{2}{3}$). Reduction 15·9 per cent.	
		RS.		RS.
3. Sub-Inspectors	First grade (122)	90	First grade	80
	Second grade (124)	80	Second grade	70
	Third grade (199)	70	Third grade	60
	Fourth grade (198)	60	Fourth grade	55
	Combined average Rs. 72·6		Combined average Rs. 64·2. Reduction in existing cost 11·6 per cent.	
4. Miscellaneous posts—				
Special Botanist	Rs. 200—10—250 (6-year scale, average Rs. $233\frac{1}{3}$).		Rs. 175—15/2—220 (7-year scale, average Rs. 204). Reduction 12·6 per cent.	
Plant collector	Rs. 30—1—40 (11-year scale, average Rs. 36).		Rs. 28—2/2—38 (11-year scale, average Rs. 34).	

II. SUBORDINATE SERVICES—*cont.*

7. Madras Forest Subordinate Service.

Posts.	Existing scales of pay: Grade.	No.	RS.	Revised scales of pay: Grade / No.	No.	RS.
1. Rangers	First	9	225	9 (5 per cent)		200
	Second	17	200	17 (10 ,,)		175
	Third	25	175	26 (15 ,,)		150
	Fourth	25	150	26 (15 ,,)		130
	Fifth	38	125	97 (55 ,,) on Rs. 75—5/2—90—10/2—110 (Average Rs. 96).		
	Sixth	42	100			
	Seventh	19	80			
		175				
	Average per post Rs. 137·3.			Average per post Rs. 122·1. Percentage of reduction in the existing cost 11·1.		
2. Foresters	First	37	50	First	37	45
	Second	79	45	Second	79	40
	Third	116	40	Third	116	36
	Fourth	132	35	Fourth	132	32
	Fifth	159	30	Fifth	159	28
		523			523	
	Average Rs. 37·2.			Average Rs. 33·8. Percentage of reduction in the existing cost 9.		

	Grade.	No.	RS.	Grade.	No.	RS.
3. Forest guards	First	101	24	First	101	23
	Second	205	21	Second	205	20
	Third	508	18	Third	508	17
	Fourth	703	15	Fourth	703	15
		1,517			1,517	
	Average Rs. 17·4.			Average Rs. 16·9.		
				Percentage of reduction in the existing cost 3.		

Miscellaneous appointments.

4. Assistant to the Chenchu Officer.	Rs. 125.	Rs. 100. Reduction in the existing cost 20 per cent.
5. Curator in the Forest College.	Rs. 100—5—150. Average Rs. 130$\frac{5}{9}$.	Rs. 85—5/2—95—10/2—125. Average Rs. 109. Reduction in the existing cost 16·5 per cent.
6. Draughtsmen	1 on Rs. 80—4—100. 6 on Rs. 60—4—80. 25 on Rs. 35—35—1½—50—1—60.	1 on Rs. 70—5/2—85. 6 on Rs. 55—5/2—70. 25 on Rs. 30—3/2—45—2/2—55.
7. Veterinary Assistants ..	3 on Rs. 60—120.	Will be regulated by the scales of pay fixed for officers in their respective departments.
Sub-Assistant Surgeon ..	1 on Rs. 75—125.	
Teachers	22 on Rs. 20—1—30.	
8. Havildars	2 on Rs. 35—35—1½—50—1—60.	2 on Rs. 30—3/2—45—2/2—55.
9. Engine-driver (temporary) ..	Rs. 60—4—80.	Rs. 55—5/2—70.

II. SUBORDINATE SERVICES—*cont.*

Posts.	Existing scales of pay.	Revised scales of pay.
8. Madras Registration Subordinate Service.		
1. Sub-Registrars	Ordinary grade—80 per cent. Rs. 65—5—150, average Rs. $110\frac{1}{3}$. Upper grade—15 per cent. Rs. 160—5—200, average Rs. $185\frac{1}{3}$. Selection grade—5 per cent. Rs. 200—10—250, average Rs. $233\frac{1}{3}$. Combined average Rs. 127·7 including selection grade.	Second grade—80 per cent. Rs. 60—$7\frac{1}{2}$/2—90—10/2—130, average Rs. $97\frac{1}{3}$. First grade—20 per cent. Rs. 140—10/2—180, average Rs. $164\frac{8}{9}$. Combined average Rs. 110·8. Reduction in the existing cost 13·2 per cent.
2. Reserve Sub-Registrars ..	Rs. 35 on appointment. Rs. 40 on completion of the departmental tests.	Rs. 30 on appointment. Rs. 35 on completion of the departmental tests. Reduction in the existing cost 13 per cent.
9. Madras Educational Subordinate Service.		
1. Deputy Inspectors of Schools, Junior scale.	50—$2\frac{1}{2}$—75 (11-year scale, average Rs. $65\frac{5}{18}$).	50—5/2—70 * (9-year scale, average Rs. $62\frac{4}{9}$). Reduction 4·4 per cent.
2. Deputy Inspectors of Schools, Senior scale, Licentiate School Assistants and Sub-Assistant Inspectresses of Schools.	First grade 25 per cent on Rs. 150—10—250 (11-year scale, average Rs. $211\frac{1}{9}$). Second grade 75 per cent on Rs. 75—5—100—10—150	First grade 20 per cent on Rs. 140—15/2—200 (9-year scale, average Rs. $177\frac{1}{3}$). Second grade 80 per cent on Rs. 70—10/2—130

* For direct recruits in future, the qualification required will be an L.T. degree.

15. Madras Co-operative Service—			
Registrar of Co-operative Societies ..	I.C.S. senior scale *plus* Rs. 200. *	1,200—100/2—1,400, 5-year scale, average Rs. 1,333 1/3.	38·5
Joint Registrar of Co-operative Societies	1,050—50—1,200, 4-year scale, average Rs. 1,170.	700—100/2—1,000, 7-year scale, average Rs. 893 1/3.	23·6
Deputy Registrars of Co-operative Societies	300—30—450—500 (E.B.)—50—750. 12-year scale, average Rs. 570.	200—30/2—260—40/2—500—50/2—700, 25-year scale, average Rs. 422 2/9.	25·8
16. Madras Industries Service—			
Director of Industries	I.C.S. senior scale *plus* 250 *	1,200—100/2—1,400, 5-year scale, average Rs. 1,333 1/3.	39·9
Deputy Director of Industries ..	750—50—1,500, 16-year scale, average Rs. 1,166 2/3.	700—100/2—1,000, 7-year scale, average Rs. 893 1/3.	23·4
Senior appointments—			
Industrial Engineer	750—25—1,000, 11-year scale, average Rs. 902 7/9.	420—30/2—600—50/2—700, 17-year scale, average Rs. 569 1/3. (for senior appointments)	20·8 (for senior and junior appointments)
Principal, School of Technology ..	250—25—500—50—800, 17-year scale, average Rs. 549 5/9.		
Principal, School of Arts and Crafts.	500—550—50/2—600—50—800—800—50—1,000, 13-year scale, average Rs. 794 4/9,		
Assistant Director (Textiles) and Principal, Government Textile Institute.	600—50—900, 7-year scale, average Rs. 796 2/3.		
Inspector of Industrial Schools ..	600—50—1,000, 9-year scale, average Rs. 853 1/3.		
Oil Chemist and Soap Expert ..	500—50—750, 6-year scale, average Rs. 666 2/3.		
Sericultural Expert	250—25—650, 17-year scale, average Rs. 467 7/9.		
Junior appointments—			
Assistant Industrial Engineers ..	300—15—450, 11-year scale, average Rs. 391 2/3.	200—30/2—410, 15-year scale, average Rs. 316 2/3. (for junior appointments)	
Senior Lecturer, School of Technology.	200—20—500, 16-year scale, average Rs. 366 2/3.		
Superintendent, Leather Trades Institute.	300—25—600, 13-year scale, average Rs. 476 2/3.		
Leather Research Chemist	300—20—500, 11-year scale, average Rs. 422 2/3. Combined average Rs. 559.	Combined average for senior and junior appointments Rs. 443.	

Remarks.—Revised scale of pay is not proposed for the Leather Expert as the post is not likely to be continued after the present incumbent retires.

17. Madras Fisheries Service—			
Director of Fisheries	750—30—1,200, 16-year scale, average Rs. 1,000.	600—75/2—900, 9-year scale, average Rs. 786 2/3.	21·3
Assistant Director (Coast)	250—25—500—50—750, 16-year scale, average Rs. 527 7/9.	200—30/2—260—40/2—500, 17-year scale, average Rs. 360. (for the three posts)	14 (for the three posts)
Assistant Director (Inland)	250—25—500, 11-year scale, average Rs. 402 7/9.		
Assistant Director (Pearl and Chank Fisheries).	200—20—400, 11-year scale, average Rs. 322 2/9. Combined average for the three posts Rs. 418.		

Remarks.—There is a temporary post of Assistant Biologist on Rs. 250 per mensem. If the post is continued after 31st March 1933, the minimum of the revised scale, viz., Rs. 200, will apply.

* No pay has been fixed for a Provincial Service Officer holding the post. The pay given is that drawn by an All-India Service officer appointed to the post.

II. SUBORDINATE SERVICES—*cont.*

MADRAS EDUCATIONAL SUBORDINATE SERVICE—*cont.*

Posts.	Existing scales of pay.	Revised scales of pay.
7. Secondary grade trained and certified teachers and higher and lower elementary trained teachers—		Secondary trained and certified teachers— Rs. 30—3/2—45—2/2—55 (21-year scale, average Rs. $42\frac{1}{12}$). Reduction = 10·6 per cent for men. Reduction = 44·6 per cent for women.
	1. *Men*—	
Secondary trained and certified teachers.	Rs. 35—35—$1\frac{1}{2}$—50—1—60 (average Rs. $47\frac{1}{12}$).	
Higher elementary trained teachers.	Rs. 25—1—50 (average Rs. $36\frac{1}{9}$).	Higher elementary trained teachers— Rs. 23—2/2—45 (23-year scale, average Rs. $33\frac{4}{15}$).
Lower elementary trained teachers.	Rs. 20—1—30 (average Rs. $26\frac{1}{9}$).	Reduction = 7·8 per cent for men. Reduction = 16·8 per cent for women.
	2. *Women*—	
Secondary trained and certified teachers.	80 per cent on Rs. 45—3—90 (average Rs. 70). 20 per cent on Rs. 100.	
	Combined average Rs. 76.	Lower elementary trained teachers— Rs. 19—2/2—23—1/2—28 (15-year scale, average Rs. 24). Reduction = 8 per cent for men. 31·4 per cent for women.
Higher elementary trained teachers.	Rs. $27\frac{1}{2}$—$1\frac{1}{2}$—50 (average Rs. 40).	
Lower elementary trained teachers.	Rs. $22\frac{1}{2}$—$1\frac{1}{2}$—45 (average Rs. 35).	

8. Pandits and Munshis ..	Two in Presidency College.	Rs. 100—5—125 (6-year scale, average Rs. $116\frac{2}{3}$).	22 on Rs. 65—$7\frac{1}{2}$/2—110 * (13-year scale, average Rs. 91).
	Twenty in Presidency College and other first-grade Arts colleges.	Rs. 75—4—95 (6-year scale, average Rs. $88\frac{2}{3}$).	
	Twelve in second-grade Arts colleges.	Rs. 50—3—65 (6-year scale, average Rs. 60)	Rs. 45—5/2—60 (7-year scale, average Rs. $54\frac{2}{3}$).
	Fifty-eight in secondary schools.	Rs. 40—2—50 (6-year scale, average Rs. $46\frac{2}{3}$).	Rs. 35—4/2—43—2/2—45 (7-year scale, average Rs. $41\frac{1}{9}$).

[* This scale will be allowed only to persons who have been trained in critical and comparative methods of study and who possess an Oriental degree of a University.]

9. Physical Training Instructors.	Rs. 35—35—$1\frac{1}{2}$—50—1—60 (average Rs. $47\frac{2}{9}$).	Rs. 30—3/2—45—2/2—55 (average Rs. $42\frac{2}{9}$). Reduction in existing cost 10·6 per cent.
..	25—1—50 (average Rs. $36\frac{1}{9}$).	Rs. 23—2/2—45 (average Rs. $33\frac{4}{15}$). Reduction in existing cost 6·7 per cent.

II. SUBORDINATE SERVICES—*cont.*

Posts.	Existing scales of pay.	Revised scales of pay.
	MADRAS EDUCATIONAL SUBORDINATE SERVICE—*cont.*	
10. Drawing Masters	Rs. 35—35—1½—50—1—60 (average Rs. $47\frac{2}{9}$).	Rs. 30—3/2—45—2/2—55 (average Rs. $42\frac{2}{9}$). Reduction in existing cost 10·6 per cent.
	Rs. 25—1—50 (average Rs. $36\frac{1}{9}$).	Rs. 23—2/2—45 (average Rs. $33\frac{4}{15}$). Reduction in existing cost 6·7 per cent.
11. Combined Drawing and Needlework Mistresses (Women's Branch).	Rs. 125—5—150.	Rs. 100—5/2—125.
12. Teachers in Amini Divi Islands (Men's Branch).	Rs. 25—1—35. Rs. 15.	Rs. 24—2/2—28—12—33. Rs. 15.
13. Manual Training Instructors.	Rs. 80—4—120.	Rs. 70—5/2—95.
	Rs. 35—35—1½—50—1—60.	Rs. 30—3/2—45—2/2—55.
	Physical Directors.	
14. Physical Directors in Colleges and Assistant Physical Director (Men's Branch).	Rs. 75—5—100—10—150 (11-year scale, average Rs. $120\frac{5}{6}$).	Rs. 70—10/2—130 (13-year scale, average Rs. $104\frac{2}{3}$). Reduction in existing cost 13·4 per cent.
	Assistant Physical Director (designation to be changed to Senior Physical Director).	
	Rs. 150—10—250 (11-year scale, average Rs. $211\frac{1}{9}$).	Rs. 140—15/2—200 (9-year scale, average Rs. $177\frac{1}{3}$). Reduction in existing cost 16·1 per cent.

15. (*a*) Workshop Instructor ..	Rs. 180.	Rs. 150.
(*b*) Workshop Assistants ..	Rs. 60—2—80. Rs. 40—2—60. Rs. 25—1—50.	Rs. 55—3/2—70. Rs. 35—4/2—55. Rs. 23—3/2—35—2/2—45.
16. Assistant Instructors (Senior and Junior) in the College of Engineering, Guindy.	1 post on Rs. 200—10—300 (11-year scale, average Rs. $261\frac{1}{9}$).	Rs. 100—10/2—200 (21-year scale, average Rs. $148\frac{8}{9}$). Reduction in existing cost 42·9 per cent.
	1 post on Rs. 125—130—10—250 (14-year scale, average Rs. $183\frac{1}{3}$).	Rs. 100—10/2—200 (21-year scale, average Rs. $148\frac{8}{9}$). Reduction in existing cost 18·8 per cent.
17. Commercial Instructors ..	(*a*) 3 on Rs. 80—4—120 (11-year scale, average Rs. $106\frac{2}{3}$).	3 on Rs. 70—5/2—95 (11-year scale, average Rs. 85). Reduction in existing cost 20·3 per cent.
	(*b*) 7 on Rs. 60—4—80.	7 on Rs. 55—5/2—70.
18. Miscellaneous posts—		
(*a*) Weaving and Spinning Assistants—		
Men's Branch ..	Rs. 35—$1\frac{1}{2}$—50.	Rs. 30—3/2—45.
Women's Branch ..	Rs. 40.	
(*b*) Power-House Superintendent, College of Engineering, Guindy.	Rs. 250—10—350 (average Rs. $311\frac{1}{9}$).	Rs. 225—15/2—300 (average Rs. 270). Reduction in existing cost 13·2 per cent.

II. SUBORDINATE SERVICES—*cont.*

MADRAS EDUCATIONAL SUBORDINATE SERVICE—*cont.*

Posts.	Existing scales of pay.	Revised scales of pay.
18. Miscellaneous posts—*cont.*		
(*c*) Pump House Operators, College of Engineering, Guindy.	Rs. 20—1—25.	Rs. 19—2/2—23—1/2—24.
(*d*) Linesmen and Electricians	Rs. 35—35—$1\frac{1}{2}$—50—1—60 Rs. 30—2—40	Rs. 30—3/2—39—2/2—45.
(*e*) Shift Operators ..	Rs. 75—5—100	Rs. 70—5/2—90.
(*f*) Fitters	Rs. 40—1—45	Rs. 35—2/2—39—1/2—40.
(*g*) Instrument repairers, College of Engineering.	1 on Rs. 30—1—50 (average Rs. 40). 1 on Rs. 60—2—80 (average Rs. $72\frac{2}{9}$).	Rs. 28—3/2—37—2/2—45 (average Rs. $34\frac{1}{2}$). Reduction 13·8 per cent. Rs. 35—3/2—53—2/2—55 (average Rs. $46\frac{1}{9}$). Reduction in existing cost 36·2 per cent.
(*h*) Stokers and cleaners, College of Engineering.	Rs. 20—1—25.	Rs. 19—2/2—23—1/2—24.
(*i*) Battery room attendants, College of Engineering.	Rs. 35—1—50 Rs. 30—1—40	Rs. 28—3/2—37.
(*j*) House-keeper (Women's Branch).	Rs. 65—4—85.	Rs. 60—5/2—75.

(*k*) Mechanics, Presidency College.	Rs. 65—5—95, 7-year scale (average Rs. $84\frac{4}{9}$). Rs. 40—2—60 (average Rs. $52\frac{4}{9}$).	Rs. 38—2/2—50, 15-year scale (average Rs. $44\frac{14}{15}$). Reduction in existing cost 19 per cent.
(*l*) Museum keepers .. and (*m*) Gas superintendent ..	Rs. 40—40—$1\frac{1}{2}$—55—1—65.	Rs. 30—3/2—45—2/2—55 *plus* a Presidency allowance of Rs. 6-8-0.
(*n*) Carpenters in schools.	Rs. 40—2—60. Rs. 25—1—50.	Rs. 35—4/2—55. Rs. 23—2/2--45.
(*o*) Blacksmiths and fitters in schools.	Rs. 40—2—60.	Rs. 35—4/2—55.
(*p*) Sergeants	Rs. 50—$2\frac{1}{2}$—75. Rs. 50—2—80. Rs. 30—2—40.	Rs. 45—5/2—70. Rs. 28—3/2—37.

10. Madras Veterinary Subordinate Services.

1. Veterinary Assistant Surgeons.	Selection grade, 15 per cent. Rs. 125—5—175 (average Rs. $155\frac{5}{9}$). Ordinary grade, 85 per cent. Rs. 60—4—120 (average Rs. $93\frac{1}{3}$). Combined average Rs. 102·7.	First-grade, 15 per cent. Rs. 110—10/2—150 (average Rs. $124\frac{8}{9}$). Second grade, 85 per cent. Rs. 55—5/2—100 (average Rs. 78). Combined average Rs. 86·3. Reduction in the existing cost 15·7 per cent.

II. SUBORDINATE SERVICES—*cont.*

Posts.	Existing scales of pay.	Revised scales of pay.
	10. Madras Veterinary Subordinate Services—*cont.*	
2. Veterinary compounders ..	Selection grade, 15 per cent. Rs. 50. Ordinary grade, 85 per cent. Madras—Rs. 33 (8-year)—34—$\frac{1}{2}$—35—5/5—40 (average Rs. 36). Mufassal—Rs. 30—$\frac{1}{2}$—35—5/5—40 (average Rs. 35$\frac{1}{5}$).	No selection grade. A single scale of Rs. 28—$\frac{1}{2}$—40 (average Rs. 33$\frac{1}{3}$). Reduction in existing cost 10·4 per cent. Compounders in Madras are to get a Presidency allowance of Rs. 2-8-0 in addition (average Rs. 35$\frac{5}{6}$).
	Combined average Rs. 37·2.	Reduction in existing cost 3·7 per cent.
3. Miscellaneous posts in the Veterinary department—		
Artist and photographer in the Veterinary College.	Rs. 85—4—125.	Rs. 75—5/2—100.
Mechanic in the Veterinary College.	Rs. 35—1—40.	Rs. 30—2/2—36.
Carpenter in the office of the Director of Veterinary Services.	Rs. 23—23—23—1—35.	Rs. 22—2/2—28—1/2—32.
	11. Madras Co-operative Subordinate Service.	
1. Sub-Deputy Registrars ..	*As sanctioned in G.O. No.* 282, *Development, dated* 25*th February* 1932.	*First grade* for Sub-Deputy Registrars in independent charge—4 on Rs. 125—10/2—175 (average Rs. 155).

	Sub-Deputy Registrars in independent charge— 4 on Rs. 150—5—200 (average Rs. $180\frac{5}{9}$). Other Sub-Deputy Registrars— 21 on Rs. 100—5—150 (average Rs. $130\frac{5}{9}$). Combined average Rs. 138·6.	*Second grade* for others— 21 on Rs. 100—5/2—125 (average Rs. 115). Combined average Rs. 121·4. Percentage of reduction in the existing cost 12·4.
2. Senior and Junior— *Inspectors*—	*Senior Inspectors*— Rs. 80—4—100 (average Rs. $93\frac{1}{3}$). *Junior Inspectors*— Rs. 40—4—60—2—80 (average Rs. $62\frac{2}{9}$). Combined average Rs. 65·2	*Senior Inspectors*— Rs. 75—5/2—90 (average Rs. $84\frac{2}{3}$). *Junior Inspectors*— Rs. 35—5/2—75 (average Rs. $56\frac{1}{3}$). Combined average Rs. 59. Percentage of reduction in the existing cost 9·2.
3. Miscellaneous appointments in the Co-operative Department—		
Manager, Office of the Registrar of Co-operative Societies.	Rs. 80—4—100.	Rs. 75—5/2—90.
Temporary Auditor (1).	Rs. 80.	Rs. 75.
Temporary Auditors (9).	Rs. 40.	Rs. 35.

II. SUBORDINATE SERVICES—*cont.*

Posts.	Existing scales of pay.	Revised scales of pay.

12. Madras Engineering Subordinate Service.

1. Supervisors

A. Permanent staff.

Existing scales of pay.	Revised scales of pay.
Rs. 80—$7\frac{1}{2}$—125 (E.B.)—130—10—250	Rs. 70—10/2—110—15/2—200.
(20-year scale, average Rs. $166\frac{8}{9}$).	(21-year scale, average Rs. $133\frac{5}{9}$).
	Reduction 20 per cent.
Recruits with Engineer qualifications start on Rs. 125.	Recruits with Engineer qualifications to start on Rs. 100.

B. Temporary staff.

Grade.	Subordinates with Engineer qualification.	Others.	Grade.	Subordinates with Engineer qualification.	Others.
	RS.	RS.		RS.	RS.
First grade ..	170	125	First grade ..	150	100
Second grade ..	160	110	Second grade ..	135	90
Third ,, ..	150	100	Third ,, ..	125	85
Fourth ,, ..	135	90	Fourth ,, ..	110	75
Fifth ,, ..	125	80	Fifth ,, ..	100	70

Reduction 16·3 per cent.

2. Overseers..

Existing scales of pay.	Revised scales of pay.
Rs. 50—$2\frac{1}{2}$—100	Rs. 50—4/2—90
(21-year scale, average Rs. 75).	(21-year scale, average Rs. $69\frac{5}{9}$).
	Reduction 7·3 per cent.

3. Draughtsmen

(*a*) Head draughtsmen in Chief Engineers' offices—

Existing scales of pay.	Revised scales of pay.
Rs. 250—10—300	Rs. 150—15/2—210
(6-year scale, average Rs. $287\frac{1}{2}$).	(9-year scale, average Rs. 191).
	Reduction 33·6 per cent.

	(*b*) Draughtsmen in Chief Engineers' offices and head draughtsmen and draughtsmen in other offices—	
	First grade, Rs. 150—10—200 (average Rs. 187$\frac{1}{2}$).	First grade, Rs. 120—10/2—150 (average Rs. 141$\frac{1}{2}$). Reduction 24·5 per cent.
	Second grade, Rs. 110—6—140 (average Rs. 132$\frac{1}{2}$).	Second grade, Rs. 90—10/2—120 (average Rs. 111$\frac{1}{2}$). Reduction 15·8 per cent.
	Third grade, Rs. 60—4—100 (average Rs. 86$\frac{2}{3}$).	Third grade, Rs. 50—4/2—90 (average Rs. 69$\frac{1}{3}$). Reduction 19·9 per cent.
4. Tracers—	*Mufassal*— Rs. 30—1—50.	Rs. 28—2/2—42—1/2—45 *plus* a Presidency allowance of Rs. 2–8–0 for men in Madras City. Reduction 7·9 per cent.
	Madras City— Rs. 33—33—33—1—50.	
5. Garden Foreman and Garden Overseer, Government House, Ootacamund.	Rs. 45—3—75.	Rs. 40—5/2—65.
6. Dam Superintendent, Periyar.	Rs. 200—5—250 (11-year scale, average Rs. 230$\frac{5}{9}$).	Rs. 175—7$\frac{1}{2}$/2—190—10/2—220. (11-year scale, average Rs. 202). Reduction 12·4 per cent.
7. Assistant Dam Superintendent.	Rs. 150—10—200 (6-year scale, average Rs. 183$\frac{1}{3}$).	Rs. 125—10/2—175. (11-year scale, average Rs. 155). Reduction 15·9 per cent.
8. Sluice Superintendent, Bezwada.	Rs. 85—5—125 (9-year scale, average Rs. 110$\frac{2}{3}$).	Rs. 75—$\frac{5}{2}$—90—$\frac{10}{2}$—100. (9-year scale, average Rs. 90$\frac{5}{9}$). Reduction 18 per cent.

II. SUBORDINATE SERVICES—*cont.*

Posts.	Existing scales of pay.	Revised scales of pay.

12. Madras Engineering Subordinate Service.

1. Supervisors

A. Permanent staff.

Existing scales of pay.	Revised scales of pay.
Rs. 80—$7\frac{1}{2}$—125 (E.B.)—130—10—250	Rs. 70—10/2—110—15/2—200.
(20-year scale, average Rs. $166\frac{8}{9}$).	(21-year scale, average Rs. $133\frac{5}{9}$).
	Reduction 20 per cent.
Recruits with Engineer qualifications start on Rs. 125.	Recruits with Engineer qualifications to start on Rs. 100.

B. Temporary staff.

Grade.	Subordinates with Engineer qualification.	Others.	Grade.	Subordinates with Engineer qualification.	Others.
	RS.	RS.		RS.	RS.
First grade ..	170	125	First grade ..	150	100
Second grade ..	160	110	Second grade ..	135	90
Third ,, ..	150	100	Third ,, ..	125	85
Fourth ,, ..	135	90	Fourth ,, ..	110	75
Fifth ,, ..	125	80	Fifth ,, ..	100	70

Reduction 16·3 per cent.

Posts.	Existing scales of pay.	Revised scales of pay.
2. Overseers..	Rs. 50—$2\frac{1}{2}$—100 (21-year scale, average Rs. 75).	Rs. 50—4/2—90 (21-year scale, average Rs. $69\frac{5}{9}$). Reduction 7·3 per cent.
3. Draughtsmen	(*a*) Head draughtsmen in Chief Engineers' offices— Rs. 250—10—300 (6-year scale, average Rs. $287\frac{1}{2}$).	Rs. 150—15/2—210 (9-year scale, average Rs. 191). Reduction 33·6 per cent.

15. Blue Print Operators ..	1 on Rs. 33—50. 1 on ,, 30—1—45. 2 on ,, 30. 2 on ,, 20. 1 on ,, 12.	6 on Rs. 20—2/2—30—1/2—35 *plus* a Presidency allowance of Rs. 2-8-0 for men in Madras City. 1 on Rs. 12.
Assistant Blue Print Operator	Rs. 15—20.	Rs. 12—17 (pay for peons) *plus* a Presidency allowance of Rs. 2-8-0.
16. Stock Verifier	Rs. 100—5—150—10—200 (average Rs. $158\frac{1}{3}$).	Rs. 85—10/2—145—15/2—175 (average Rs. $134\frac{1}{2}$). Reduction 15·1 per cent.
17. Telepho..e gumastas ..	61 on Rs. 20—1/2—25 and 6 on Rs. 25—1/2—35.	61 on Rs. 19—1/2—24. 6 on Rs. 23—2/2—33.
18. Overseer, Humpi Ruins ..	Rs. 65—5—140.	Rs. 50—4/2—90.
19. Government Horticulturist	Rs. 75—5—125 (average Rs. $105\frac{5}{9}$).	Rs. 65—5/2—70—$7\frac{1}{2}$/2—100 (average Rs. 86). Reduction 18·9 per cent.
20. Clock winder	Rs. 23.	Rs. 20.
21. Irrigation conservancy subordinates.	380 on Rs. 20—1/2—25.	380 on Rs. 19—1/2—24.
22. Mechanical Foreman ..	Rs. 110	Rs. 90
23. Forwarding officer	Rs. 35	Rs. 30
24. Lorry drivers	2 posts on Rs. 40—60 1 post on Rs. 55.	3 on Rs. 40—2/2—50
25. Maistris	2 on Rs. 50—$2\frac{1}{2}$—100 1 on ,, 35—1—55 *7 on ,, 30—1—50 6 on ,, 30—1—45 1 on ,, 30—$1\frac{1}{2}$—45	2 on Rs. 50—4/2—90 3 on ,, 30—2/2—50 12 on ,, 28—2/2—40

* Includes four temporary posts in the Agency.

II. SUBORDINATE SERVICES—*cont.*

Posts.	Existing scales of pay.	Revised scales of pay.
	MADRAS ENGINEERING SUBORDINATE SERVICE—*cont.*	
26. Store-keepers	1 on Rs. 200—10/2—250 (average Rs. 232½).	1 on Rs. 150—5/2—155—7½/2—200 (average Rs. 177⅞). Reduction 23·5 per cent.
	1 on Rs. 100—2½—125 (average Rs. 116⅔). 1 on Rs. 80—2—100—5—125 (average Rs. 106¼).	2 on Rs. 70—3/2—85—5/2—100 (average Rs. 86½). Reduction 22·4 per cent.
	1 on Rs. 65—3—78 (average Rs. 74¾).	Rs. 50—5/2—70 (average Rs. 63⅔). Reduction 14·7 per cent.
27. Ledger Verifier	Rs. 65—4—85.	Scale of pay for clerks.
28. Gate-keepers	2 on Rs. 20—1—25	Rs. 19—1/2—24
	5 on Rs. 12—18	Rs. 12—17, the scale applicable to peons.
29. Canal clerks	3 on Rs. 20—1—30	Rs. 19—2/2—23—1/2—28
30. Navigation Superintendent..	Rs. 50—2½—100	Rs. 50—4/2—90
31. Water Regulation establishments.	Superintendents—1 on Rs. 21	1 on Rs. 20
	1 on Rs. 16	1 on ,, 15
	Maistri—1 on Rs. 27	1 on ,, 25
32. Quarry Superintendent ..	Rs. 20—1—30	19—2/2—23—1/2—28
33. Conservancy Sergeant ..	Rs. 80	Rs. 70
34. Irrigation conservancy subordinate.	1 on Rs. 20—35	19—1/2—24

AGENTS FOR THE SALE OF MADRAS GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

IN INDIA

The Superintendent, Nazair Kanun Hind Press, Allahabad.
M. C. Kothari, Bookseller, Publisher and Newspaper Agent, Raopur Road, Baroda.
R. Sunder Pandurang, Kalbadevi Road, Bombay.
D. B. Taraporevala Sons & Co., Bombay.
Thacker & Co. (Ltd.), Bombay.
N. S. Wagle, Circulating Agent and Bookseller, No. 6, Tribhuvan Road, Girgaon, Bombay.
The Burma Book Club (Ltd.), 240-a, Merchant Street, Rangoon, Burma.
The Book Company, Calcutta.
Butterworth & Co. (Ltd.), 6, Hastings Street, Calcutta.
R. Cambray & Co., Calcutta.
Thacker, Spink & Co., 3, Esplanade East, Calcutta.
Shri Shankar Karnataka Pustaka Bhandara, Malamaddi, Dharwar.
The Dominion Book Concern, Booksellers, Publishers, Main Road, Hyderabad.
Ramakrishna & Sons, Lahore.
The Proprietor, The Punjab Sanskrit Book Depot, Motilal Banarsidass, Saidmitha Street, Lahore.
The Upper India Publishing House (Ltd.), Lucknow.
The Christian Literature Society for India, Post Box No. 501, P.T., Madras.
City Book Co., Post Box No. 283, Madras.
Higginbothams (Ltd.), Mount Road, Madras.
The Law Book Depot (Ltd.), 15 & 16, Francis Joseph Street, Madras.
S. Murthy & Co., Madras.
G. A. Natesan & Co., Madras.
P. R. Rama Iyer & Co., Madras.
P Varadachari & Co., Booksellers, 8, Linga Chetti Street, Madras.
The Universal Publishing Co., Bezwada (Madras).
D. Sree Krishnamurthi, Editor, "Grama Paripalana," Morrispet, Tenali, Guntur (Madras).
E. M. Gopalakrishna Kone, Pudumantapam, Madura (Madras).
The Modern Stores, Salem (Madras).
The Srivilliputtur Co-operative Trading Union (Ltd.), Srivilliputtur (Madras).
S. Krishnaswami & Co., Teppakulam Post, Trichinopoly Fort (Madras).
A. Venkatasubban, Law Bookseller, Vellore (Madras).
Nivasarkar, Manager, "Hitawada," Nagpur.
The International Book Service, Booksellors, etc., Poona 4.
The Booklovers' Resort, Booksellers and News Agents, Taikad, Trivandrum.

IN STRAITS SETTLEMENTS

The Federal Rubber Stamp Co., Penang.

NOTICE

Official publications may be obtained in the United Kingdom either direct from the office of the High Commissioner for India, India House, Aldwych, London, W.C. 2, or through any bookseller.

TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS